TEXTUAL VARIATION IN RELATION TO THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

by

Michael Riley Pelt

Program of Graduate Studies in Religion
Duke University

Date: May 25, 1966

Approved:

Kenneth W. Clark
Kenneth W. Clark, Supervisor

James L. Price

Hugh Anderson

Wm. F. Stinespring

Robert S. Rogers

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Program of Graduate Studies in Religion
in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
of
Duke University

1966

ABSTRACT

(Religion)

TEXTUAL VARIATION IN RELATION TO THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

by

Michael Riley Pelt

Program of Graduate Studies in Religion
Duke University

Date: May 25, 1966

Approved:

Kenneth W. Clark
Kenneth W. Clark, Supervisor

James L. Price

Hugh Anderson

Wm. F. Stinespring

Robert S Rogers

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the Program of Graduate
Studies in Religion in the Graduate School of
Arts and Sciences
of
Duke University

1966

Tr.R.
Ph.D.
P393T
1966

ABSTRACT

TEXTUAL VARIATION IN RELATION TO THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

by

Michael Riley Pelt

There has been scant recognition among New Testament scholars that the text of the New Testament has suffered numerous alterations in the interests of doctrine. This situation may be attributed in part to the explicit denial of an earlier generation of textual critics that such modifications of the text are to be found in our extant witnesses. Although the assumption that the text is free of doctrinal modifications has been challenged by reputable scholars, few have undertaken to demonstrate the full extent and scope of such alterations and to reveal their cumulative effect upon the interpretation of the text.

It is frequently asserted that among the many textual variations to be found in the witnesses to the text not one affects the substance of Christian doctrine. While a particular doctrine may neither stand nor fall because of the testimony of a significant textual variation, it is a reasonable contention in the light of this study that the development of Christian doctrines has at times been affected by the form of the text known and used by the church in specific localities.

By combing through the apparatus criticus and gathering data from many limited studies on the phenomenon of textual variation we have selected as many

as one hundred and seventy-five passages in the New Testament in which an important difference of theological interpretation rests upon the choice between two or more variant readings. More attention has been given to variant readings found in witnesses attesting earlier forms of the text but not a few have been discussed which appear only in later witnesses. We have endeavored in this study to make a selection that will be representative of a much larger number of variant readings which might be found to have theological significance. Where there are two or more significant variations in the text of a given passage we have discussed the possible motives and/or the doctrinal implications of the divergent readings.

In order to demonstrate that such variations in the text of the New Testament represent a wide range of theological interest, those included in this study have been discussed under the following major headings: God, Jesus Christ, and the Life of the Christian Community. Each of these major headings has been developed into a chapter, subdivided according to the particular interests reflected in the textual variations.

As a result of this investigation we conclude that the number of doctrinal or theological variations in the text is much greater than is commonly recognized. We further contend that doctrinal motivation is as important as other factors in the effort to determine the origin of significant variations in the text. The cumulative weight and critical significance of such variation should no longer be disregarded by the interpreter of the text of the New Testament. Further, the cumulative effect of such changes reflects major theological interests in the time and place, when these textual changes occurred.

The influence of particular men (e.g., Marcion) and movements (some heretical) upon the text has been demonstrated, as well as the counter-influence of those guardians of the text who sought to eliminate or alter what was regarded as doctrinally unacceptable.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the contribution of those who have rendered valuable assistance in the preparation of this dissertation.

First, to my advisor, Professor Kenneth Willis Clark of Duke University, I owe the suggestion of this topic as a fruitful area of research. His own interest in the subject has been a constant stimulus throughout the course of this investigation. Without his expert counsel and advice the results of this study would not have been possible. My gratitude is also extended to other members of my committee, especially Professor Hugh Anderson, who read portions of the first draft of the manuscript and made helpful suggestions.

Second, I wish to thank Duke University for a grant during the summer of 1965 and for the award of a Gurney Harriss Kearns Fellowship in Religion during the 1965-66 academic year.

Third, to my wife I owe an immeasurable debt for her services in typing the first draft of the manuscript while doing double duty as a housewife and a public school teacher. Hers was, indeed, a labor of love.

Finally, I wish to express appreciation to Mrs. Alfreda Kaplan for her painstaking care and skill in preparing the final typescript copies.

M.R.P.

SIGLA OF IMPORTANT GREEK MANUSCRIPTS AND VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Papyri	Century
P1	III
P5	III
P38	c.300
P40	III
P45	III
P46	c.200
P47	III
P50	IV
P66	c.200
P72	III-IV
P74	VII
P75	c.200

Uncials		Century
ℵ (S)*	Sinaiticus	IV
A	Alexandrinus	V
B	Vaticanus	IV
C	Ephraem Syrus	V
D	Bezae	V-VI
D^p	Claromontanus	VI
E	Basiliensis	VIII
E^a	Laudianus	VI-VII
F	Boreelianus	IX
F^p	Augiensis	IX
G	Wolfii A	X
G^p	Boernerianus	IX
H	Wolfii B	IX-X
H^p	Coislinianus	VI
K	Cyprius	IX-X
L	Regius	VIII
L^{ap}	Angelicus	IX
P	Porphyrianus	X
W	Washingtonianus	V
Δ	Sangallensis	IX
Θ	Koridethi	IX
Ξ	Zacynthius	VII-VIII
Ψ	Athous Laurae	VIII-IX
Ω	Athous Dionysiou	VIII-IX
046	Vaticanus 2066	VIII-IX

*The writer has used the symbol "S" to designate Codex Sinaiticus.

The Latin Versions

Old Latin		Century
a	Vercellensis	IV
b	Veronensis	V
c	Colbertinus	XII
d	Bezae (ea)	V-VI
d	Claromontanus (p)	VI
e	Palatinus	V
f	Brixianus	VI
ff^1	Corbiensis 1	X
ff^2	Corbiensis 2	V-VI
g^1	Sangermanensis 1	IX
g^2	Sangermanensis 2	X-XI
gig	Gigas	XIII
h	Floriacensis	VI
i	Vindobonensis	V-VI
k	Bobbiensis	IV-V
l	Redhigeranus	V
m	Pseudo-Aug. Speculum	
q	Monacensis	VII
r^1	Usserianus 1	VII
r^2	Usserianus 2	IX-X
z	Aureus	VIII

The Latin Vulgate indicates the general consensus of manuscripts giving the recension of Jerome (A.D. 384).

The Syriac Versions

Syr. cur.	Curetonian	V
Syr. sin.	Sinaitic	IV-V
Syr. pesh.	Peshitta	V
Syr. phil.	Philoxenian	VI
Syr. pal.	Palestinian	VI
Syr. hkl.	Harklean	VII

The Coptic Versions

Copt. boh.	Bohairic	VI-VII
Copt. sah.	Sahidic	III-IV

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vi

SIGLA OF IMPORTANT GREEK MANUSCRIPTS AND VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT vii

I INTRODUCTION: A THEOLOGICAL APPROACH TO TEXTUAL CRITICISM 2

II VARIANTS BEARING UPON THE DOCTRINE OF GOD 37

III VARIANTS WHICH BEAR UPON THE PERSON OF CHRIST 82

IV VARIANTS BEARING ON THE LIFE OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY 170

V CONCLUSIONS 235

BIBLIOGRAPHY 248

INDEX OF NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES 264

TEXTUAL VARIATION IN RELATION TO THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION: A THEOLOGICAL APPROACH TO TEXTUAL CRITICISM

A casual examination of any one of several modern printed editions of the Greek New Testament will reveal that there are many thousands of variants in the text, which have been brought to light as a result of careful study and collation of Greek manuscripts, versions and church fathers.[1] For almost fifteen hundred years before the invention of printing the text of the New Testament was copied by hand, mainly in the Greek language but to a great extent also in other languages of both East and West. This method of transmitting the text would inevitably result in countless variations introduced by scribes engaged in reproducing copies of New Testament writings for the use of individuals and churches. The great demand for copies of these writings, even as early as the second and third centuries, prompted many an amateur scribe to copy one or more of the Gospels, or perhaps the collection of Paul's letters, for his own use or for the edification of the Christian community of which he was a part.

Because of the rapid growth of Christianity in the early centuries of the church the desire for additional copies of Scripture in all probability exceeded the number that could be produced with any degree of accuracy. Likewise, the need for translations of these writings among Christians who could not use the Greek language compelled some ill-equipped persons to undertake the translation of some part of the New Testament, which led Augustine to complain that in the early days of the faith "anyone who happened to gain possession of a Greek manuscript and who imagined that he had some facility in both Latin and Greek, however slight that might be, dared to make a translation."[1]

---

[1] As early as 1707 John Mill collected some 30,000 variants which he published in his edition of the Greek N.T. The number has increased several times that figure since Mill's monumental work was published.

At some points in the early history of the text, particularly in the larger centers of Christianity, a concerted effort was made to control the great diversity of readings in the manuscripts and to "correct" what were understood to be errors that had crept into the now sacred text. This effort to control the form of the text and to reduce the great amount of variation in the manuscripts received its earliest impetus probably at Alexandria, where Christian scholars who wrestled with the meaning of Scripture found it necessary to establish a standard text of the New Testament. Other centers of Christian influence, such as Antioch and Caesarea, soon followed suit.[2] It is impossible to determine when such editorial efforts were begun. The evidence of the earliest papyri, for example, when compared to the great codices of the fourth and fifth centuries, has led us to conclude that this recensional activity was already in progress during the third century and even as early as A.D. 200.[3]

---

[1] De Doctrina Christiana II.xi.16. Translation cited by Bruce M. Metzger, The Text of the New Testament (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 14. Hereafter cited as Metzger, Text.

[2] See B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1925), pp. 35 ff. Hereafter cited as Streeter, The Four Gospels.

[3] Calvin L. Porter, "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus," JBL, LXXXI (1962), 363-376, finds that P75 has a close affinity with Codex Vaticanus and concludes that this is clear evidence of the existence in Egypt at the end of the second century of a type of text characterized by

Even though this move toward the establishment of standard texts was doubtless under way in the third century, it did not reach a final conclusion until much later, for the evidence is clear that the various texttypes continued to be influenced by one another until the Byzantine[1] recension became the dominant type of text used in both East and West. Moreover, studies of the Byzantine text by von Soden and others have shown that modifications occurred at various stages of development in the transmission of this text.

Westcott and Hort, in their extensive study of the history of the text, concluded that the "Neutral" text alone, as represented mainly by Codex Vaticanus, suffered comparatively little corruption in the course of its transmission.[2] There are, to be sure, scribal errors in Codex Vaticanus; but, according to these scholars, there is in this manuscript almost no evidence of stylistic revision, or assimilation between parallel texts, or incorporation of extraneous matter. It is now generally recognized that such confidence in a single manuscript as preserving "a very pure line of very ancient text"[3] may have contributed greatly to the conclusion of Westcott and Hort that their text represented a close approximation to the original words of the New Testament.[4]

Westcott and Hort as "Neutral." The almost total absence of "Western" readings in P75, in contrast to P45 and P66, leads him to declare further: "It appears likely that the texttype represented by the texts of P75 and Codex Vaticanus did not have its origin in the so-called 'western' text." Ibid., p. 375. To this he adds: "It is impossible to attribute the origin of this texttype to a scholar living about A.D. 300. The texttype represented by these two manuscripts is best described as a gradual development." Ibid.

[1] Referred to variously as the Byzantine text, the Koine text, the Ecclesiastical text or the Syrian text.

[2] B. F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek. Vol. II, Introduction and Appendix (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882), pp. 250 f. Hereafter cited as Hort, Introduction.

[3] Ibid., p. 251.

[4] Ibid., p. 284.

Even those textual critics who owe most to Westcott and Hort are hardly willing to share their view that, practically speaking, we can ignore the evidence of all but a few chosen manuscripts.[1] The gradual accumulation of more evidence in the form of early witnesses to the text, the identification of the Caesarean text and its subgroups, and more intensive studies on the Western text have led to the realization that textual scholars must not confine their attention to any one form of the text in their search for the original.

The Issue of Dogmatic Alterations

In order to display the different kinds of errors to be found in the many witnesses to the text of the New Testament, scholars have divided them into two major categories--intentional and unintentional.[2] The first of these categories has been subdivided into several groups on the basis of possible scribal motives, such as: the desire to improve the spelling and grammar, to harmonize parallel passages or quotations from the Old Testament, to clear up historical and geographical difficulties, to conflate divergent readings in order to preserve important elements, and, finally, to alter the text in the interest of particular doctrines or theological tendencies.[3] It is this last type of scribal alteration which is of greatest importance for this study.

---

[1] E.g., F. G. Kenyon, Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), pp. 81 f. Hereafter cited as Kenyon, Recent Developments.

[2] See, e.g., Metzger, Text, Chapter VII; Vincent Taylor, The Text of the New Testament (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1961), pp. 2 f. Hereafter cited as Taylor, Text; Leon Vaganay, An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, trans. by B. V. Miller (London: Sands & Co., Ltd., 1937), pp. 55-64. Hereafter cited as Vaganay, Introduction.

[3] See Metzger, Text, pp. 195 ff.

There would seem to be little desire on the part of textual critics today to question the existence of variants motivated by theological considerations; yet this has not always been the case. The most eminent New Testament textual scholar of the nineteenth century, Dr. F.J.A. Hort,[1] stated unequivocally his opinion that there is no substantial evidence of dogmatic alteration among the countless readings that exist in the witnesses to the text. In order to state the issue as clearly as possible, we shall do well to use Dr. Hort's own words: "It will not be out of place to add here a distinct expression of our belief that even among the numerous unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes."[2] Such alterations as there are which do appear to reflect a doctrinal motive may be explained as in the nature of paraphrase or as attempts to correct previous scribal errors and, according to Hort, "they bear witness to rashness, not to bad faith."[3] Commenting upon the omission of Luke 22:43 f. in certain important witnesses, Westcott and Hort declare: "Notwithstanding the random suggestions of rash or dishonest handling thrown out by controversialists, there is no tangible evidence for the excision of a substantial portion of narrative for doctrinal reasons at any period of textual history."[4] Despite the many accusations by the early fathers of willful tampering with the text, Dr. Hort knows of only one man in antiquity who deliberately altered the text for dogmatic purposes. That was Marcion, whose *Gospel* and *Apostle* were adapted for the use of his followers. But this form of the text, Hort thinks, had apparently no influence outside the Marcionite sect.[1]

---

[1] See Hort, *Introduction*, p. 18, where we are told that Dr. Hort wrote the *Introduction*.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 282.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 283.

[4] *Ibid.*, Appendix, p. 66.

This statement by Hort has had a decided effect upon later textual critics, some of whom have restated his opinion in their own words or have been content to suggest one or more minor exceptions to this point of view.[2] Conservative critics, in particular, have been quick to point out that in spite of the existence of numerous variant readings in the Greek manuscripts and other witnesses to the text, none of them has even the slightest effect upon theological interpretation of the text. As if to reassure his readers who may have begun to wonder about the possible theological implications of so many variations introduced by the scribes who transmitted the text, Sir Frederic Kenyon in a popular history of the text declares: "No fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith rests on a disputed reading." To which he adds, "It cannot be too strongly asserted that in substance the text of the Bible is certain. Especially is this the case with the New Testament."[3]

Kirsopp Lake, in his incomparable little volume on textual criticism, admitted the possibility of doctrinal modifications of the text, but failed to give any evidence that would tend to support or nullify the argument.[4] In his inaugural lecture delivered before the University of Leiden in 1904, Lake argued cogently against the supposition that the earliest text of the Gospels included baptismal conditions and injunctions in those passages on which the church has based its dogma of the dominical authority of the sacrament of baptism--viz., Matthew 28:19, Mark 16:16, and John 3:5.[1] In the same address he referred to the discovery by F. C. Conybeare that Eusebius quotes Matthew 28:19 at least eighteen times in the form "Go ye into all the world and make disciples of all nations in my name," omitting all reference to baptism.[2] Earlier Eberhard Nestle had called attention to the fact that "nearly all the heretics were in turn accused of falsifying the Scriptures."[3] By this he meant that much early Christian literature was written under false names. But more important for our purpose is this statement by Nestle:

---

[1] Hort, Introduction, p. 283. The question of Marcionite influence on the text will be discussed later. See pp. 10-14 below.

[2] See, e.g., B. B. Warfield, An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1889), p. 96, who writes: ". . . it is doubtful if any doctrinal corruptions can be pointed to with complete confidence." A. T. Robertson, Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament (2nd ed.; New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., Inc., 1928), pp. 158 ff. Hereafter cited as Robertson, Introduction.

[3] Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts (4th ed.; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940), p. 23.

[4] K. Lake, The Text of the New Testament (6th ed., rev. by Silva New; London: Rivingtons, 1928), p. 6. Hereafter cited as Lake, Text.

> At the same time it cannot be denied that alterations were also made on early Christian works and the books of Scripture in the interests of dogma. These alterations are of all sorts, ranging from quite harmless changes made in all innocence to supposed corrections, and, it may be, even willful corruptions.[4]

Not only were there charges against the heretics for corrupting the Scriptures, but, according to Nestle, "Even within the pale of the Church one party attributed such practices to the other."[5]

---

[1] Idem, The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament (Oxford: Parker and Son, 1904), pp. 8-21.

[2] Cf. F. C. Conybeare, "Three Early Doctrinal Modifications of the Text of the Gospels," The Hibbert Journal, I (1902-03), 96-113. Hereafter cited as Conybeare, "Modifications." Conybeare concluded, as a result of his researches, that the original text of this passage likely ended with the word "nations" and that other existing readings developed independently.

[3] Eberhard Nestle, Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, trans. from the 2nd ed. by William Edie (London: Williams and Norgate, 1901), p. 197. Hereafter cited as Nestle, Introduction.

[4] Ibid., pp. 197 f. Nestle cites several passages from the fathers which indicate the kinds of alterations made by the heretics.

[5] Ibid., p. 198.

But it was Rendel Harris more than any other scholar of this period who questioned Hort's assumptions concerning the absence of any dogmatic alterations among the many intentional variants in the text of the New Testament.[1] He adduced evidence intended to show that Marcionite influence is present in certain witnesses to the text of Luke and suggests that all such changes are not the work of Marcion alone. "They are due to a school as well as to a master. And if one school can alter the text, why not another?"[2] From this he proceeded to demonstrate the influence of Tatian's Encratite views on the text at certain points.[3] He then turned to the question of whether Ebionite or Adoptionist views are reflected in those textual variations which involve the role of Jesus as the Elect of God. His conclusion is "that Dr. Hort cannot be right in divesting the various readings of New Testament MSS of dogmatic significance, or in assuring us of the universal bona fides of the transcribers."[4]

A. T. Robertson, after discussing the major points in Harris's thesis, adds this comment: "I agree that Harris has here scored on Hort, a difficult thing for any man to do."[5] Actually Hort had already been challenged on a number of vital issues, including his high regard for the purity of the textual tradition represented by Codex Vaticanus.[1] But unfortunately the protagonists sought to defend a form of the text which was manifestly the result of editorial activity over a period of several centuries.[2]

---

[1] See his Sidelights on New Testament Research (London: The Kingsgate Press, 1908), Lecture I and Appendix, pp. 1-35. Hereafter cited as Harris, Sidelights; idem, "New Points of View in Textual Criticism," The Expositor, Series VIII, vol. VII (1914), 316-334. Hereafter cited as Harris, "New Points of View."

[2] Harris, Sidelights, p. 31; cf. idem, "New Points of View," pp. 318-320; idem, "Was the Diatessaron Anti-Judaic?" HTR, XVIII (1925), 103-105.

[3] Harris, Sidelights, pp. 31 f.

[4] Ibid., p. 34. A similar view in regard to the Vulgate text was expressed by the late Samuel Berger: "Enfin la dogmatique elle-meme a sans doute une grande part de responsabilité dans la corruption du texte de la Bible latine. Les altérations dogmatiques, en effet, ne sont pas rares dans le texte de la Vulgate . . . . Les doctrines les plus chères aux théologiens du moyen age exercent toutes leur influence sur le texte de la Bible." See his Histoire de la Vulgate (Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie, 1893), p. viii.

[5] Robertson, Introduction, p. 160. Robertson warned his readers against going to the other extreme from Hort and Warfield and finding "doctrinal perversion at every turn." Ibid.

Apparently Rendel Harris's first attempt to unseat this cherished view of Hort's many supporters was not given the attention which he felt that it deserved. He had appealed to the judgment of scholars on the issue of whether or not "the religious movements of any time or country affect the text of that time or country."[3] Six years later he repeated his assertion, calling it "a new method in textual criticism," which could be summarized as follows: "[T]hat the history of the text must be read side by side with the history of the Church, and in the light of the various parties into which the Church was divided."[4] Harris was particularly concerned to show that Marcion and Marcionite views had influenced the text of the Gospel of Luke, for Hort had stated his belief that Marcion's dogmatic mutilation of the books which he accepted had apparently no influence outside his own movement,[5] despite the fact that the Marcionite movement at one time covered a large portion of the entire Church. Harris had succeeded in making a strong case for the argument that Marcionite views had corrupted the text of Codex Bezae and three Old Latin manuscripts in Luke 4:16,[1] yet he was obviously disturbed because of the meager response to his suggestion among leading textual critics of the day.[2] A few years later he repeated his basic argument without adding any substantial amount of evidence in its support.[3]

---

[1] See, e.g., the caustic rebuttal of the English Revised Version and its underlying Greek text by J. W. Burgon and Edward Miller, _The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels_ (London: George Bell & Sons, 1896); _idem_, _The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels_ (London: George Bell and Sons, 1896). See esp. the latter volume and Appendix II, pp. 282-286.

[2] The _Textus Receptus_, which went through numerous editions and scores of printings, was a late form of this recension otherwise known as the Byzantine text.

[3] Harris, _Sidelights_, p. 32.

[4] Harris, "New Points of View," pp. 319 f. In the same article he described one side of the textual criticism of the New Testament as "a study, which is as full of interest and of meaning as Church History itself, to which it properly forms a literary pendant, and without which it often cannot be understood." _Ibid._, p. 316. Here he anticipates the viewpoint of later textual critics such as Merrill M. Parvis and Kenneth W. Clark.

[5] Hort, _Introduction_, p. 283.

Meanwhile there was considerable interest among other scholars on the question of Marcionite influence upon the text of the New Testament through his own version of the Gospel of Luke and the ten Pauline Epistles accepted by him.[4] Leon Vaganay, a noted textual critic of this period wrote:

> Strange as it may seem, the readings adopted by the heresiarch were more than once reproduced by the copyists of the Church's text. Traces of them are found nearly everywhere, in the old Latin versions, the old Syriac and even in the *Vaticanus* (Romans 1, 16) . . . . Some of them may date from before his time; but he gets the credit of them; and, indeed, he was too cool a worker to limit himself to doctrinal retouches.[5]

---

[1] Harris, *Sidelights*, pp. 29-31; *idem*, "New Points of View," pp. 318 f. The reference to Jesus having been "brought up" (τεθραμμένος) is omitted in Codex D, and the possessive pronoun "his" before "custom" is omitted in Codices D, a, and c, while the entire clause is omitted in Codex e.

[2] Harris asked a pointed question: "Is it nothing to have proved that a group of the greatest manuscripts of the Western text are tainted and perhaps saturated with Marcionism?" See "New Points of View," p. 320.

[3] Harris, "Was the Diatessaron Anti-Judaic?" pp. 103-105.

[4] William Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1876); Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (2nd ed.; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924). Hereafter cited as Harnack, *Marcion*; *idem*, *Neue Studien zu Marcion* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1923). Later studies of Marcion's text include: John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942; E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence* (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1948). Hereafter cited as Blackman, *Marcion*.

[5] Vaganay, *Introduction*, p. 103.

Adolf von Harnack in his extensive studies on Marcion was more cautious in his appraisal of the latter's influence on the text. He allowed the possibility that Marcionite readings had crept into the Western text of Luke in only a few scattered places,[1] and that the same is true for the letters of Paul.[2] Theodore Zahn, in his monumental work on the history of the canon, had reached quite negative conclusions on this question of Marcionite influence.[3] He reasoned that in view of the hostility of the church toward Marcion it would be unthinkable that his text, condemned as it was as being heretical, should have exerted any positive influence on that of the church. Zahn argued instead, as others have since done, that the readings which Marcion and the Western text have in common are to be explained not as inventions of Marcion but taken by him from a form of the text used by the church at that time. Certainly the majority of such variants in the Western text which are found also in Marcion can readily be explained in this manner; nevertheless, it would be presumptuous to argue that all such agreements between Marcion's text and the Western text are to be understood on the basis of their being present in a pre-Marcionite form of the text.[4]

More recent studies of Marcion's influence on the Western text indicate a more positive view than that of Zahn. Harnack, as we have shown, does not agree with Zahn in denying that Marcionite readings influenced the Catholic text, but he suggests that their influence was very limited.[1] M. J. Lagrange would go further than Harnack in allowing the possibility of Marcionite influence on texts which were used by the Catholic Church.[2] Walter Bauer adds one important passage to the list supplied by Harnack, which in his opinion must be attributed to the work of Marcion.[3] This is the so-called longer text found in Luke 22:19b-20. E. C. Blackman, in a study of the influence of Marcion's text on the Old Latin witnesses, concludes that such influence was very limited, but he states that on the whole "the influence of Marcion on Catholic texts was greater than Harnack allowed."[4] The entire matter needs further investigation before any final conclusions may be drawn, yet enough evidence is already at hand to show that the influence of Marcion on the text of the New Testament can no longer be denied.

---

[1] These include Luke 5:39, 9:54 ff., 22:43 f., 23:2, 23:34, 24:12, 24:40. Cited by E. C. Blackman, *Marcion*, p. 50, n. 5.

[2] These include Gal. 5:14, Rom. 1:16, I Cor. 15:3, I Thess. 2:15, Eph. 4:6, 5:31. (*Ibid.*) E. C. Blackman finds another Marcionite reading in Luke 24:37, preserved in Codex D alone (φάντασμα). *Ibid.*, p. 51, n. 2.

[3] Theodore Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1889), p. 636. I am indebted at this point to Eberhard Nestle, *Introduction*, p. 208.

[4] The whole question is a complex one: (1) We have little direct evidence of any form of the text earlier than Marcion. (2) The text of Marcion itself must be derived from the fathers, chiefly Tertullian, and we do not know how faithfully they have given us the authentic text of Marcion.

Much of the evidence for Marcionite corruption of the text might well be expected to have disappeared in that period after the orthodox church had marshaled all its influence against the views of that heretic and his many followers. We may well assume that many orthodox leaders would seek to purge the documents of the new canon of Scripture of any signs of Marcionite corruption. This same effort would likewise be applied to those readings which were suspected as having been introduced by other known heretical teachers. Kirsopp Lake took the view that the paucity of evidence for doctrinal modifications of the text must be explained in part by "the vigilance with which the orthodox and the heretics regarded each other's efforts in this direction."[1]

---

[1] Marcion, pp. 154 f.

[2] See his review of Harnack's first edition of Marcion in Revue Biblique, XXX (1921), 611.

[3] Cited by E. C. Blackman, Marcion, p. 157.

[4] Blackman, Marcion, Appendix 7, pp. 128-168. See esp. p. 158.

It is a frequent assumption that in the second and third centuries none but the leaders of heretical movements would dare to manipulate the sacred text to make it conform to their own beliefs and opinions and that the leaders of orthodoxy would not resort to such methods in their defense of the truth.[2] This assumption ought perhaps to be questioned as in fact it has been by the Lakes in their *Introduction to the New Testament*:

> It is generally argued that Marcion revised the text to suit his own ideas of the truth, but it is not certain that the Catholic text does not contain changes made in opposition to Marcion, and possibly to other heretics. . . . The nature of a Catholic and of a heretic in those days was not so different that the one may be supposed to have emended the text often and the other never.[3]

Earlier Kirsopp Lake had ventured to make the following judgment concerning the Catholic response to Marcion's emendation of the text:

> Marcion did not find the original text either of the Epistles or of the Gospel of Luke quite adequate to support his teaching and he emended the texts of both. I suspect, though I cannot prove it, that his opponents did the same, so that very probably neither the Marcionite nor the Catholic text of the Epistles or Gospel of Luke is identical with the original text . . . I do not think that Catholic nature was any different from Marcionite nature and I believe that at that period both parties would probably have changed the text to suit their own opinions.[4]

---

[1] Lake, *Text*, p. 6.

[2] I am indebted in this paragraph to E. C. Blackman, *Marcion*, pp. 128 f.

[3] Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1937), p. 99. These scholars observed: "The time is ripe for an investigation of the possibility that the current Greek Text of the (Pauline) Epistles shows traces of an anti-Marcionite and possibly anti-Gnostic revision." *Ibid.*, pp. 99 f.

[4] Kirsopp Lake, *Paul: His Heritage and Legacy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1934), pp. 112 f.

The Fluid Condition of the Text in the Early Period

There are signs of recognition among some church historians that during at least the first century in the history of the Christian movement there was a wide variety of beliefs and opinions held by those who made up the Christian Church and that "orthodoxy" in the later meaning of that term was by no means the prevailing sentiment. Walter Bauer, the great lexicographer, in a book which first appeared in 1934 but which was not given the attention it deserved, in part because of the nature of the times but also because Bauer was considered to be a lexicographer and not a historian, made a critical examination of that point of view which developed early in the writing of church history, "according to which the course of church history was determined by a simple straight line of development."[1] This line of development began with the self-revelation of Jesus and continued through the twelve apostles to their successors in the post-apostolic period. It was characterized by harmony in faith and doctrine and a steady progress and expansion. The heretical groups are seen not as independent expressions of faith and practice in the development of the history but as a "waste-product of orthodoxy," whose only significance is that they confirm the integrity and orthodoxy of the church.[2]

---

[1] Georg Strecker, "A Report on the New Edition of Walter Bauer's Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum," JBR, XXXIII (1965), 53-56. Hereafter cited as Strecker, "A Report on the New Edition of Bauer's Rechtgläubigkeit." Strecker has edited a second edition of Bauer's book and added a supplement, which deals with the Jewish-Christian heretics in relation to orthodoxy. See Walter Bauer, Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum (Zweite, durchgesehne Auflage mit einem Nachtrag herausgegeben von Georg Strecker; "Beitrage zur Historischen Theologie 10"; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1964). Hereafter cited as Bauer, Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei (2nd ed.). I am indebted to G. Strecker for his report on the new edition in the January, 1965, issue of JBR.

[2] Strecker, "A Report on the New Edition of Bauer's Rechtgläubigkeit," p. 53.

In his attempt to test this point of view, which is shared by church historians both ancient and modern, Bauer raises the fundamental question whether the relationship between the church and heresy is to be understood in such a manner that "already for the earliest times, at any given stage of development, the church doctrine represents the primary, but the heresies on the contrary are some kind of modification of the genuine."[1] Bauer then proceeds to make a careful survey of the beginnings of Christianity in several areas, using sources known to have been written in these areas, and demonstrates the widespread predominance of heterodox or heretical views in important Christian centers, which only later came under the influence of orthodoxy. He identified Rome as the dynamic center of orthodoxy, whose appeal to apostolic tradition and whose successful encounter with the "heretics" and the fires of persecution soon established her reputation as a "headquarters" of orthodoxy. This led to the result that the contents of orthodoxy were also formed by Roman Christianity.[2]

Walter Bauer's examination of the relationship between heresy and orthodoxy in this early period was criticized first by Roman Catholics and finally by an Anglican, H.E.W. Turner,[3] who maintains the view that heresies are always "specific types of deviation from a still undeveloped core of more original true beliefs, e.g., Gnosticism is their 'dilution,' Marcion's doctrines a 'truncation,' Montanism a 'distortion,' and Arianism an 'evacuation.'"[4]

---

[1] Strecker, "A Report on the New Edition of Bauer's *Rechtgläubigkeit*," p. 54. Here strecker quotes Bauer's own words.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[3] *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations Between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church* ("Bampton Lectures," 1954; London: Mowbray, 1954.

[4] Helmet Koester, "ΓΝΩΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΙ: The Origin of Diversification

Turner gives considerable attention to Bauer's argument for the prevalence of heterodox or heretical influences in such important centers as Edessa, Alexandria, and Asia Minor, but finds them unconvincing.[1] He suggests that the root difficulty of Bauer's argument is that the latter fails to attain an adequate view of the nature of orthodoxy, which, according to Turner, is richer and more varied than Bauer allows.[2] On the other hand, Turner makes a significant acknowledgment in the following statement:

> Bauer makes many valuable suggestions which deserve further exploration. It is probable that orthodoxy may have been more hard-pressed in certain Churches during the early period than it has been customary to admit. Orthodoxy and heresy certainly lay side by side during the period, and we shall find the suggestion of a penumbra between orthodoxy and heresy deserving of further examination.[3]

Other scholars have offered criticism of Bauer's position on various points,[4] but it must be said that his approach to the question of the relationship between heresy and orthodoxy has awakened a new interest in the study of early Christianity with emphasis on its diversity. Recent discoveries of papyri, such as those at Nag Hammadi, and the renewed interest in the study of early Christianity which has developed out of these discoveries will doubtless contribute to a greater appreciation of Bauer's major thesis. John Knox in his book Marcion and the New Testament speaks for a growing number of scholars when he says that Bauer's monograph "has done much to correct our understanding of the theological situation within the churches of the late first and early second centuries." Knox continues: "Within this period there was,

---

in the History of Early Christianity," HTR, LVIII (1965), 281, n. 4. For further criticism of Turner's book, see Georg Strecker's appendix to Bauer, Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei (2nd ed.), pp. 293-300; A. Ehrhardt, "Christianity Before the Apostles' Creed," HTR, LV (1962), 93.

[1] See The Pattern of Christian Truth, pp. 39-80.

[2] Ibid., p. 80.

[3] Ibid.

[4] A. Ehrhardt, op. cit., pp. 92-119.

strictly speaking, no such thing as heresy and orthodoxy."[1] There was instead a great diversity of belief among churches and among individual Christian teachers and no particular set of beliefs had achieved real pre-eminence.[2] More recent studies have tended to confirm this view. E. C. Blackman in his excellent book on Marcion has stated this position as clearly as anyone in these words:

> It must be borne in mind that the distinction between heretics and orthodox was not as clear in the second century as it later became. Most of the heretics claimed to be genuine Christians and to be expounding the pure Gospel, and there is no need to doubt the sincerity of such claims.[3]

Arnold Ehrhardt in a recent article has provided us with a more adequate picture of the complex nature of Christianity, before the formation of the Apostles' Creed, with its many forms of belief and expression.[4] Again, Helmut Koester in a scholarly treatment of the subject, which owes much to Bauer and to recent studies on the Gospel of Thomas, surveys the major areas which Christianity occupied in the East during the first and second centuries.[5] He offers a convincing analysis of the historical situation in this early period which further weakens the traditional approach to the study of early Christianity by insisting on the lack of any consistent norm of orthodoxy.

If Rendel Harris was correct in his view that the text of the New Testament must be studied in the light of church history and theology, then the contributions of Bauer and other scholars are not without significance for the textual critic. Harris once wrote: "The Bible of any given church becomes affected by the church in which it circulates. The people who handle the text leave their finger-prints on the pages, and the trained detective can identify the criminal who made the marks."[1] After illustrating his remark by reference to various forms of heresy in the early church, he continues:

---

[1] Knox, Marcion, p. 4.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Blackman, Marcion, p. 128.

[4] See Ehrhardt, "Christianity Before the Apostles' Creed," pp. 73-119.

[5] Koester, "ΓΝΩΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΙ ," pp. 279-318.

> Nor should we have any need to state such a simple proposition, if it were not that ill-advised attempts have been made to heighten the sanctity of the documents of the New Testament by assiduously stressing their orthodoxy, as if the biblical text had its own _Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus_, which history shows not to have been attained by the Church itself.[2]

Most of the writings which make up the New Testament were circulated widely and were copied many times before they were regarded as canonical Scripture. There would be little hesitation on the part of scribes or owners of copies of these writings to alter them in accordance with their particular interests and needs as the occasion might demand. The Gospels, for example, were not regarded as the peculiar property of Matthew, Mark, Luke or John, whose names may well have been of no great importance to many who used these documents. We know that Marcion handled his _Gospel_ freely and there is no reason to believe that many other leaders would not have done the same. The important thing to the minds of these early Christians was the message which they proclaimed, not the exact words of a particular presentation of that message, such as the Gospel of Mark. The popularity of Gospel harmonies like that of Tatian and many others which circulated both in the East and in the West is testimony to the lack of concern for the precise words of a particular document. It was not until Marcion set forth his _Gospel_ and _Apostle_ that the church in the West began to see the need for a canon of its own, together with a simple rule of faith which could be used as a norm of orthodoxy. Even so, it was late in the second century before leaders in the West like Irenaeus had developed an effective means of identifying and exposing heretical teachers and their doctrines. It was later still before orthodoxy could become the prevailing system in Egypt and most of the East. In view of all this the text of those writings which make up the New Testament must have suffered numerous alterations which can best be explained as attempts to make the text conform to the particular theological interests of those who made use of these writings. Thus it is reasonable to suppose that those who transmitted these writings would be willing to alter the text in the direction of "improvement" from their point of view, even when this involved passages bearing upon matters of Christian faith and practice.[1]

---

[1] Harris, "Was the Diatessaron Anti-Judaic?" p. 103.

[2] _Ibid_.

Nor is there any valid reason to suppose that this tendency to alter the text for dogmatic purposes was discontinued as soon as orthodoxy had become established in the major centers of Christian influence. In many widely separated places where Christianity had taken root and flourished, copies of New Testament writings would continue to be produced which bear the marks of certain theological interests. It has been said that all the really important variant readings arose during the first and the second centuries.[2] That statement has been repeated in different forms from time to time by recognized textual critics.[3] Yet it ought not to be understood that no alterations of any significance were made after c. A.D. 200, for that would mean that later scribes and editors of the text never allowed their own personal judgments to enter into their work because of their great reverence for the sacred text. In 1928 Kirsopp Lake wrote:

---

[1] Leon Wright, Alterations of the Words of Jesus (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952), pp. 43-71. This study had its inception as a Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1945. Wright has demonstrated several kinds of alterations in the words of Jesus made by the second-century fathers, including those which may be attributed to dogmatic motivation. Cf. E. L. Titus, "The Motivation of Changes Made in the New Testament Text by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1942).

[2] Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 36.

[3] See, e.g., E. C. Colwell, "Biblical Criticism: Lower and Higher," JBL, LXVII (1948), 7.

> To those who think as we do--that the mental attitude of an age is apt to be reflected in its texts, we would commend a study of the differences between the general character of the Caesarean and Neutral texts on the one hand and the K^a and Ecclesiastical texts on the other. The third and fourth centuries used the Neutral and Caesarean texts; both are marked by clearness of choice and decision between alternatives. It is not an accident that these centuries were those which formulated the great doctrines of Catholic Christianity, and that the fifth century, which used the Antiochean and Ecclesiastical texts, was in the East chiefly characterized by compromise in doctrine and conflation in text.[1]

There have been almost no systematic attempts to bring out the evidence for doctrinal influences on the Ecclesiastical or Byzantine text of the New Testament. This situation might be improved if scholars were more familiar with the text of the New Testament in the writings of the church fathers, particularly those after the fourth century. An example of what might be accomplished was demonstrated by Ernest W. Saunders,[2] whose investigation of a medieval manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Duke University collection turned up six significant examples of the influence of an eleventh-century commentary of Theophylact with which the scribe was evidently familiar.[3] We may well hope that future studies in the Byzantine text will give attention to the possibility of doctrinal influences on the text at various points in the history of its transmission.

---

[1] Kirsopp Lake, "The Ecclesiastical Text," HTR, XXI (1928), 345.

[2] Ernest W. Saunders, "Studies in the Doctrinal Influences on the Byzantine Text of the Gospels," JBL, LXXI (1952), 85-92. Idem, "The Textual Criticism of a Medieval Manuscript of the Four Gospels (Duke MS Gr. 7)" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1943), pp. 52-76.

[3] Saunders, "Studies in the Doctrinal Influences," pp. 86 f.

A New Perspective in Textual Criticism

In recent years there has been a growing recognition of the role of textual criticism as a historical discipline. As early as 1908 Rendel Harris had pointed to the relationship between the work of the textual critic and that of the church historian and theologian.[1] The great textual critics of the nineteenth century saw their task clearly to be that of restoring the original text of the autographs and regarded any historical aspect of their study as a by-product of the main task. Since the opening of the twentieth century increasing attention has been given to more careful studies in the history of the transmission of the text and the identification of many of its local forms.[2] In 1936 D. W. Riddle called for "a frank recognition and a consistent application of what is implied in the change of objective."[3] He redefined the task of textual criticism as one that is

> not limited to the recovery of approximately the original form of the documents, to the establishment of the "best" text, nor to the "elimination of spurious readings." It must be recognized that every significant variant records a religious experience which brought it into being. This means that there are no "spurious readings": The various forms of the text are sources for the study of the history of Christianity.[4]

---

[1] See his Sidelights, pp. 1-35.

[2] See, e.g., Kirsopp Lake, Codex 1 of the Gospels and Its Allies ("Texts and Studies"; Cambridge: The University Press, 1902) VII, No. 3. Idem, "The Text of the Gospels," Studies in Early Christianity, edited by S. J. Case (New York: The Century Company, 1928), pp. 21-47; Kirsopp Lake, Robert Blake and Silva New, "The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark," HTR, XXI (1928), 207-404; K. Lake, "The Byzantine Text of the Gospels," Memorial Lagrange (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1940), pp. 251-258; K. and Silva Lake, Family 13 (The Ferrar Group): The Text According to Mark with a Collation of Codex 28 of the Gospels ("Studies and Documents"; Philadelphia: University of Penn. Press, 1941), XI.

[3] D. W. Riddle, "Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline," ATR, XVIII (1936), 221. Hereafter cited as Riddle, "Textual Criticism."

[4] Ibid. One may well take exception to the precise language used in this statement (such as, "there are no 'spurious readings'"), but the overall meaning is clear.

Thus Riddle makes the plea that more attention be given to the rejected readings which have been laid aside by the critic in his search for the original text with the firm conviction that such readings will throw light on the history of Christianity at many points.

Conversely, the textual critic who would endeavor to understand the origin of variant readings must be a careful student of church history and theology. He must familiarize himself with the doctrines, institutions and events that have played a significant role in the course of the history of Christianity during that period when the text of the New Testament was transmitted by handwritten copies.[1]

A corollary to this new emphasis on the relationship between the New Testament text and the history of Christianity is the growing conviction among certain textual critics of the tremendous difficulty, if not the impossibility, of recovering the original text of the New Testament writings. This conviction is based in part on the complex nature of our earliest witnesses to the text and the consequent problem of reconstructing the history of the text in the first Christian centuries. This problem is complicated in the case of the Gospels by the recognition that for some time after they were written the oral tradition, from which they were derived, continued to "corrupt" the written form. The well-known statement of Papias that he preferred "the living and abiding voice" of tradition to the written records of what the Lord had said and done is a reminder that the oral tradition was undoubtedly a factor which influenced the form of the text well into the second century and perhaps afterward.[1] Two continental scholars, Erick Fascher[2] and Manfred Karnetzi,[3] have in recent years undertaken studies of the earliest forms of the text in an attempt to trace the influence of oral tradition on the earliest transmission of the text. They argued that the same "laws" operative in the development of the oral tradition could be seen at work in the written tradition. Most of their examples are drawn from the text of Codex Bezae, the foremost representative of the Western text. However, it has been questioned whether we are justified in applying the laws of form criticism to manuscripts as late as the fifth or sixth century in view of all the many other influences upon the text which could account for various types of alterations.[4] Of greater importance for this study is the fact that E. Fascher demonstrates in particular with examples from Luke-Acts that behind the Western text stands a known theological intention.[5] He evidently regards the Western text as a secondary form which enjoyed wide circulation in the early church and the dissemination of which the early church did not seek to prevent, thus leaving open the question which text should be regarded as revealed.[6]

---

[1] M. M. Parvis, "Text, NT," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by George A. Buttrick (4 vols.; New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), IV, 613, says: "The NT textual scholar who is working from within the Christian tradition must be more than a textual critic in the narrow sense of the word. He must be in a certain sense, not only a textual critic but a church historian, a historian of Christian thought, and a theologian as well."

---

[1] For this suggestion I am indebted to Frederick C. Grant, "Where Form Criticism and Textual Criticism Overlap," JBL, LIX (1940), 13.

[2] Textgeschichte als hermeneutiches Problem (Halle: Veb Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1953).

[3] "Textgeschichte als Überlieferungsgeschichte," ZNW, XLVII-XLVIII (1956-57), 170-180.

[4] A.F.J. Klijn, "A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts (1949-1959)," Novum Testamentum, III (1958-59), 162 f.

[5] See the note on Fascher's volume in ZNW, XLV (1954), 268 f.

[6] Ibid.

This recognition of the extreme complexity of the evidence to be used in establishing the original form of the text has led some scholars to question the validity of the genealogical method in textual criticism[1] and to suggest that "no objective method can take us back through successive reconstructions to the original."[2] Even more pointed is the following statement by E. C. Colwell:

> In other words, the textual critic today in his ultimate decisions must operate as historian and theologian. True, textual criticism still pays lip service to genealogy but it has not used this method; it still talks about the great texts, but no great text has been reconstructed. I have argued elsewhere that genealogy is a broken reed. The greatest textual scholars of the past fifty years . . . admit either explicitly or implicitly the impossibility of moving back through the great texts to the original text. The history of the transmission of the New Testament shows this clearly.[3]

Colwell does not advocate the abandonment of the task of reconstructing the original text, but he argues that this task cannot be accomplished by the use of only those sources peculiar to the discipline of textual criticism itself. Instead he maintains that "the reconstruction of the original text must be made against the large tapestry of early Christian history with an understanding of the rich colors of early Christian theology. This is implicit in the two rules of criticism which I have cited before."[4]

Merrill M. Parvis, taking his cue from an earlier statement by D. W. Riddle,[5] went even further than the latter in his estimate of the importance of variant readings which were introduced into the manuscripts at different levels in the history of the text. Basing his evaluation of textual variants on the fact that each manuscript was a Bible, accepted as such by a Christian community at some particular time and place, he declares:

---

[1] Ernest C. Colwell, "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and Limitations," JBL, LXVI (1947), 109-133.

[2] *Idem*, "Biblical Criticism," p. 11.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 6. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 11. [5] See above p. 22.

> There are no spurious readings: all are the product of the tradition of the church, whether they originated in the twelfth century or in the first. The textual critic, then, should value the readings of his late manuscripts just as he does those of his early manuscripts. All are a part of the tradition; all contribute to our knowledge of the history of Christian thought. And they are significant contributions because they are interpretations which were highly enough thought of in some place and at some time to be incorporated into the Scripture itself.[1]

Parvis questions the assumption that manuscripts have reproduced themselves according to the Mendelian law so that each one can be neatly fitted into the categories of texttypes and families and sub-families.[2] This approach has been found wanting particularly in the case of those manuscripts which do not fit in the established schemes. "Would it not," he asks, "be better to trace the relationships of manuscripts through their individual readings or, rather, through their reflections of a particular doctrine or dogma?"[3] It is reasonable to suppose, as he suggests, that our manuscripts of the New Testament may not have been reproduced so mechanically as we have thought, but that a given manuscript may reflect the particular theological interpretation which was in the foreground at the time and place it was produced.[4]

Meanwhile the issue of doctrinal modification of the text has received attention from a number of able critics. On the European continent two notable scholars, Daniel Plooij and Adolf von Harnack, offered further evidence in support of the view which Rendel Harris and other English scholars had championed.[1] Then, in 1941 W. F. Howard published an article in which he summarized the contributions of earlier textual critics who had dealt with this issue.[2] He discussed four passages containing significant doctrinal variants on which Harris had earlier focused attention.[3] He pointed out the obvious danger of the method employed by Harris, "that we should start with certain controversies and look for textual phenomena which will fit into our expectations of what ought to have happened."[4] Leaving open the question of heretical influence on the text or the possibility of orthodox attempts to remove certain anomalies from the same, Howard then discussed a few passages "of considerable doctrinal import" in which the textual evidence is ambiguous.[5] Finally, he notes two or three places "where slender traces remain of an almost forgotten reading whose rising or falling may have been due to dogmatic interests."[6] The variants on which Howard has focused attention reflect in his opinion the keen intellectual concern of the church in the first four centuries for the deposit of the faith. The history of Christian thought in this period is, in his words, "largely a record of the tension between the liberal and the conservative elements at work in the doctrinal formulation of the tradition and experience of the Church's Lord and Saviour."[1] We can agree with him when he adds: "The history of the text of the New Testament provides a small commentary upon that period of mental strife."[2]

---

[1] "The Nature and Task of New Testament Textual Criticism," _Journal of Religion_, XXXII (1952), 172. In view of the fact that Scripture and tradition continued to affect each other down through the history of the Church in both East and West, Parvis contends that the modern textual critic must take this Catholic point of view into consideration in evaluating the many variant readings peculiar to the different forms of the text. _Ibid._, pp. 170 ff.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 173.

[3] _Ibid_.

[4] _Ibid_. He would also make this same statement in regard to the lectionaries and the versions.

---

[1] D. Plooij, Tendentieuse Varianten in den Text der Evangelien (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1926; A. Harnack, "Zwei alte dogmatische Korrekturen im Habraerbrief," Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche (Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter und Co., 1931), pp. 235-252.

[2] "The Influence of Doctrine upon the Text of the New Testament," The London Quarterly and Holborn Review, CLXVI (1941), 1-16. Hereafter cited as Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine."

[3] These included: Luke 4:16, John 1:34, Luke 22:43, 44 and Luke 23:34. Cf. Harris, "New Points of View," pp. 316-334.

[4] Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine," p. 9.

[5] Ibid., pp. 9 ff. These include I John 5:7, 8 (Comma Johanneum); Matt. 1:16; John 1:11-14.

[6] Ibid., p. 13. These include I John 4:2, Heb. 2:8-10, 5:7-9.

The extent to which the text of the Synoptic Gospels reflects the doctrinal controversies concerning the Person of Christ was made abundantly clear in an important monograph written by C.S.C. Williams.[3] Although he is concerned with several types of intentional variants, his most important contribution is to be found in his discussion of those variants which have Christological significance. Not all scholars will agree with his judgment concerning the original reading in specific passages,[4] but this does not cancel out the value of his study in revealing the doctrinal implications of significant variations in the text.

An excellent treatment of intentional variation in sayings of Jesus as quoted by second-century Christian writers is to be found in a monograph by Leon E. Wright, published in 1952.[5] Among the motives for change in the form of the sayings of the Lord, as these are found in the canonical Gospels, Wright

---

1. Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine," p. 16.

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951). See esp. Chap. 4, "Doctrine and the Text of the Gospels." Hereafter cited as Williams, *Alterations*.

4. E.g., he prefers the longer reading in Luke 22:19-20, a matter on which there is considerable disagreement. *Ibid.*, p. 51.

5. *Alterations of the Words of Jesus.*

singles out those which are to be attributed to dogmatic motivation and those which are the result of heretical adaptation.[1] Further studies in the text of the fathers may well be expected to produce additional evidence to substantiate the argument of doctrinal motivation in the text of the New Testament.

In a further attempt to raise the issue of doctrinal implications in textual variations, Kenneth W. Clark of Duke University offers evidence in the text of the Pauline Epistles against the assumption that textual variants in no way affect the traditional doctrines of the church.[2] He points to several instances in the letters of Paul where the ambiguity of textual evidence in passages dealing with important doctrines of the church shows that theological tenets are affected by the choice of existing variants.[3] Against those who insist that no important doctrine of our faith is touched by what textual criticism has revealed concerning the text of the New Testament, Clark urges the view that Christian beliefs are directly affected by the condition of our text. If the role of the New Testament is that of interpreter of doctrine and if the text of the New Testament shows signs of doctrinal alteration, then it becomes necessary for the textual critic to refine the text so that it may serve as a sound basis for the doctrinal interpretation of the New Testament.[4]

It would be beyond the scope of this study to include all such attempts to support the argument for theological motivation in the textual variants of of the New Testament. However, a recent study by Eldon J. Epp of the Western text in the book of Acts, which indicates a definite anti-Judaic tendency in Codex Bezae and other Western witnesses, deserves some attention if for no other reason than the fact that some earlier scholars had not been able to detect any theological bias in the Western text of Acts.[1] Rendel Harris as early as 1891 argued that the Western text of Luke and the Acts had at some time passed through Montanist hands with the result that Montanist influence is to be seen in certain of its readings,[2] yet this view was not widely accepted by scholars. Indeed Harris himself was more interested in explaining the distinctive Western readings on the basis of Latinization.[3]

---

[1] Wright, Alterations of the Words of Jesus. See Chaps. 8 and 9 respectively.

[2] "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwaan (Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953), pp. 52-65. Hereafter cited as Clark, "Textual Criticism and Doctrine."

[3] These passages include: Rom. 8:28; I Cor. 2:1, 6:20, 7:5, 10:19, 11:29, 13:3, 14:38, 15:51.

[4] Clark, "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," pp. 54, 55, 65.

Although Epp acknowledges his indebtedness to the contributions of earlier scholars who pointed to the presence of certain theological tendencies in the Western text of Acts,[4] he has provided a thorough analysis of those readings in Codex Bezae and other important Western manuscripts which among other things shows that a strong anti-Judaic element is present in approximately forty percent of the distinctively Western readings in Acts.[5] This theological approach to the study of the Western text, resulting in the discovery of such a pervasive tendency in the Western text of Acts is a further vindication of the thesis that theological motivation is an important factor to be reckoned with in the study of the New Testament text.

---

[1] See Eldon J. Epp, "Theological Tendency in the Textual Variants of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis: Anti-Judaic Tendencies in Acts" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1961. Hereafter cited as Epp, "Theological Tendency." Cf. J. H. Ropes, The Text of Acts ("The Beginnings of Christianity": Part I. The Acts of the Apostles; London: Macmillan and Co. Limited, 1926), III, ccxxiii.

[2] J. Rendel Harris, Codex Bezae ("Text and Studies"; Cambridge: at the University Press, 1891), II, 148-153, 221-225.

[3] Epp, "Theological Tendency," p. 3. "Others sought to explain the Western text from Syriac influence, or on the basis of Aramaic, or along other lines." Ibid., pp. 3 f.

[4] Chief among them was P. H. Menoud, "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts," Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas: Bulletin II (Oxford: The Oxonian Press Ltd., 1951), pp. 19-32.

[5] Epp, "Theological Tendency," p. 226, n. 3.

The Purpose of This Investigation

The whole question of theological motivation in the text of the New Testament is a fascinating study, which only in recent years has begun to receive the attention it deserves from textual critics and those whose scholarly labor depends upon the text of the New Testament. Textual criticism has been regarded in the past as primarily a task for the scholar interested only in working with textual data on the basis of objective criteria. The goal of textual critics was, as we have seen, the recovery of the "original" text. There was a widespread assumption, following the publication of the Westcott-Hort text and the final overthrow of the *Textus Receptus*, that the major task of textual criticism had been largely completed. Any new evidence which turned up was not expected to unsettle the structure which had been so painstakingly erected over a period of several decades. But the discovery of new manuscripts, including the papyri, several of which are earlier than the most important uncials, together with the identification and careful study of forms of the text unknown to nineteenth-century critics, has created many new problems for the textual critic and has fostered a growing consensus among scholars in favor of the "eclectic method" of recovering the original text. This situation is likely to continue until such time as the evidence now available has been assimilated and a new theory of the text has been derived from it, upon which it will be possible to construct a new textual edifice.[1]

This climate of uncertainty about the best approach to be taken in achieving the primary goals of textual criticism, which include writing the history of the text as well as recovering as nearly as possible the original form of the New Testament documents, has stimulated the search for all types of evidence that will enable scholars to trace the path of development which the text has taken. An approach which may well contribute to a more complete understanding of the evidence now available to textual critics is the emerging emphasis on theological influences on the transmission of the text.

Some scholars will perhaps take exception to this approach on the grounds that it introduces a subjective element into a discipline which must in the end depend upon more objective evidence for its validation; yet most critics are willing to acknowledge that we cannot dispense with the inevitable subjective element in textual criticism. Indeed, a certain amount of subjective judgment is required if the textual critic is to reach a decision on the many complex questions that confront him in the course of his work. If it is true that the various witnesses to the text were not produced in a merely mechanical fashion and that they frequently reflect the use of human judgment and opinion, the textual critic must necessarily be ready to apply his own best judgment in the solution of textual problems. At the same time he must be willing to acknowledge that doctrinal and theological matters are at times involved in this process. This investigation will seek to draw attention to a number of passages in the New Testament containing variant readings, in which doctrinal or theological implications bear upon the choice of readings. There will not be a consistent effort within this study to determine the "original" reading in each case. In many instances the external and internal evidence is so well "balanced" that a final determination is impossible. Rather, the main thrust of the investigation will be to establish the thesis that doctrinal or theological issues are present in the choice of available variant readings in the text of the New Testament. It will be seen from this statement that our major concern is not to prove that the scribes were doctrinally motivated. That has already been demonstrated by reputable scholars, whose work is partially described in the previous pages. However, wider evidence of doctrinal modification will be presented in this investigation which will indicate that theological interpretation of the text is affected by scribal alteration, far more than is commonly supposed. The main purpose will be to show that variations in the text of numerous passages in the New Testament do involve the theological or doctrinal interpretations of these passages.

---

[1] For an excellent summary of the present state of textual criticism see Kenneth W. Clark, "The Effect of Recent Textual Criticism upon New Testament Studies," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1964), pp. 27-51; cf. H. H. Oliver, "Present Trends in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," JBR, XXX (1962), 308-320.

A slightly different point of view is expressed in a recent publication which is widely used as a text in college courses on the New Testament.[1] After stating briefly the nature of the task of textual criticism, the authors of this work add this comment:

> Although there are hundreds of interesting interpretative points which turn on the choice (of readings) that is made among the possibilities offered by the various manuscripts, there is no essential historical or theological point that is determined one way or another by textual variants.[2]

---

[1] Howard Clark Kee, Franklin W. Young, and Karlfried Froehlich, Understanding the New Testament (2nd ed.; Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

[2] Ibid., p. 61.

What this statement seems to imply is that for all practical purposes the study of textual variations in the New Testament may offer here and there an interesting sidelight for the more inquisitive student, but the latter need not think that any historical or theological point is seriously affected by any existing variations in the text. This raises acutely the question of the relevance of textual criticism in the study of the New Testament, the answer to which should be obvious to every exegete and theologian whose work depends heavily upon the text of the New Testament. If the variations in the text do not decidedly affect the historical and theological questions which are so much involved in the content of the New Testament, why is it so important to use a critical text of these writings as a basis for exegetical and theological labors? One might just as well choose any form of the text or even any given manuscript produced at some time in the long history of the transmission of the text as the basis for one's interpretation of the New Testament. The author(s) of the above statement is either unaware of the implications of recent discussion in the area of New Testament textual criticism, or else he regards the important tasks of textual criticism as having been essentially completed, leaving only the more technical details of analyzing individual manuscripts to be done by textual critics in the future. This oversimplification of the nature and function of textual criticism has done much to hinder the progress of work in this area. The advance of New Testament scholarship can best be served by informing the student of the basic problems in all significant areas of New Testament research, including textual criticism, and then pointing in the direction of possible solutions to these problems. The volume to which we have referred gives less than an adequate account of the textual criticism of the New Testament. In this respect it is not unlike most other texts which are intended to introduce the college student to the basic documents of the Christian faith.

The Method

We have stated that our main purpose in this study is to demonstrate the presence of theological or doctrinal issues in numerous variations in the text of the New Testament. This effort is being made because of a conviction that in many instances theological considerations are involved in the choice of particular readings which appear in the various witnesses to the text, both original readings and later emendations.

We are keenly aware of the difficulties involved in this undertaking and the immensity of the task. One factor which makes the task so difficult is the subjective element of judgment which is involved. There will inevitably be disagreements in dealing with theological questions and with the bearing of particular variants on matters of theology. Such disagreements cannot be avoided, but we must take the risk of possible error in judgment if we are to deal with problems of this nature. Indeed, we are convinced that no solution to many of the problems of textual criticism is possible without an element of subjective criticism.[1] To take this position does not mean the abandonment of objective methods for the criticism of the text, but it simply recognizes that textual criticism is an art as well as a science.

In the search for variations in the text we have not limited ourselves to a single document of the New Testament or to a selected group of witnesses, although the vast majority of the variations dealt with in this study are found in the more important Greek manuscripts and the major versions. Moreover, we have not cited every variation in the text which may appear in a given passage but only those which are relevant for this study. We recognize that it is not within the ability of any man to locate all the significant theological variants in the text of the New Testament, but we have endeavored to make a selection that will be representative of the many which might be found to have theological significance. The reader will perhaps be aware of others which have been overlooked in this study. Our indebtedness to the findings of numerous scholars will be evident in the course of these pages.

---

[1] Cf. Kenyon, Recent Developments, p. 86.

In order to demonstrate that doctrinal or theological variants in the New Testament represent a wide range of theological interest, it was decided that those variants which are to be included in this study should be discussed under the following major headings: God, Jesus Christ, and the Life of the Christian Community. The fact that these topics, along with others, are usually represented in an outline of systematic theology should not imply any attempt to write a text on theology. Rather, it was felt that this arrangement of the subject matter would provide full scope to the treatment of a broad spectrum of theological interest represented by doctrinal variation in the text of the New Testament.[1]

---

[1] I am indebted to Prof. Kenneth W. Clark for this suggestion concerning the arrangement of the material for the purposes of this investigation.

Chapter II

VARIANTS BEARING UPON THE DOCTRINE OF GOD

The Christian doctrine of God is in large measure derived from the witness of the Old Testament and other literature which circulated among Jews and Christians during the formative period in the history of the early church. Of equal importance in the shaping of this doctrine was the experience of those who were witnesses of the ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ and the subsequent witness of the Holy Spirit in the life of the primitive church. But even these experiences had to be interpreted by the earliest Christians and the variety of interpretation is manifested in the New Testament itself. Moreover, the conviction of the Spirit's continued presence in the church as interpreter of the revelation brought by Jesus Christ gave further impetus to the development of doctrine, including the doctrine of God. This development took several forms, particularly as the church in its Gentile mission found it necessary to relate the concept of God to peoples of differing religious and cultural background. But development did not cease in this early period, for in some degree each new generation of Christians has had to rethink and reshape its own understanding of God in the light of the experience of the earliest Christians and of subsequent interpretations by the faithful throughout the history of the church.

One of the most important questions raised by the impact of Jesus' ministry, death and resurrection upon his followers was his relationship to God.

There was a strong tendency in the early church to emphasize the divine nature of Jesus, a fact which prompted many to ask how this could be reconciled with their belief in one God. The numerous titles ascribed to Jesus by his followers, as these are used in all of the major documents of the New Testament, are an indication of the many possible ways of conceiving the unique role of Jesus and of throwing light on the question of his relation to God. Although most of the early fathers were willing to acknowledge his divinity, the matter of his relation to God was a subject of debate during the third and fourth centuries until the early councils of the church declared that the Son is coequal and coeternal with the Father. Arius, and others before him, had argued that the Father alone is God while the Son occupies a role midway between God and man--a demigod. According to Arius, the Son was a finite being who was made divine because God foresaw his future ethical achievements.[1] This view was rejected at the Council of Nicea and subsequent councils in favor of the doctrine that the Son is equal with the Father. This controversy over the Father-Son relationship is reflected in certain variations in the text of the New Testament of which the following are examples.

John 10:29

The commonly accepted reading of this verse is that found in the traditional English translations: "My Father, who has given them to me, is greater than all. . . ." (RSV). This reading has the support of fam. 1, fam. 13, Syr. sin. and cur., and more recently the Bodmer Papyri, P66 and P75.

---

[1] J. L. Neve, A History of Christian Thought (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1946), I, 115.

Codex Vaticanus has a different reading in this verse which may be translated, "That which my Father has given to me is greater than all. . . ." Codex Sinaiticus and the Freer Gospels support a third alternative, but the translation of this reading is rather awkward. The first and second readings are more important for our purposes.

The best-known English translations show a decided preference for the reading followed by the RSV. Some editors of the Greek text, however, are not in agreement with this. Westcott-Hort, Tischendorf and Nestle adopted the reading of Codex Vaticanus. The matter of deciding which reading is primary is not a simple one. The context does not make a clear case for either reading; however, the first reading seems to be in harmony with what the Evangelist says elsewhere about the Father and the Son. In John 14:28 Jesus is reported as saying, " . . . the Father is greater than I." This is not contradicted by what is said in 10:30: "I and the Father are one," for in the Fourth Gospel the unity of the Father and the Son is not simply metaphysical; it is primarily a moral unity. The Son is obedient to the Father and can do nothing on his own authority (cf. 5:19-30).

Without such an understanding of Johannine Christology the text of 10:29 might easily have been misunderstood by some scribes if the original text read, "My Father, who has given them to me, is greater than all. . . . I and the Father are one." (RSV, vss. 29-30) Alteration of the Greek text would be a simple matter (ὅ...μεῖζον for ὅς...μείζων). If the text were thus altered, it would clearly avoid the assertion that the Father is greater than all (including the Son and the Holy Spirit). The variant reading, therefore, provides an alternative view in which the "greater" refers not to the Father but to "what the Father has given" to the Son. The change in the Greek is slight but the difference in meaning involves an interpretation of the doctrine of the relationship between the Father and the Son.

Eric Lane Titus has called attention to a passage frequently quoted by Clement of Alexandria in a variant form, which reveals his interpretation of the relation between the Logos and the Father.[1] In his Paedagogue Clement quotes John 1:1 with a variation in the last phrase-- ἐν τῷ θεῷ in place of πρὸς τὸν θεόν. According to Titus, a study of the passages in which Clement cites this verse shows that he tended to make this substitution. There is reason to believe that the change was motivated by doctrinal considerations. Clement was apparently not always careful to distinguish clearly between the Logos and God, as was pointed out by R. B. Tollington, who wrote:

> [I]n a number of passages the unity and equality of the Son with the Father is implied or directly taught under terms of local or mutual relationship. The Son is in the Father and the Father is in the Son. Such duality is compatible with the completest unity, for "both are a unity even God." Clement is fond of varying Saint John's term of relationship [πρός] for one of more local connotation [ἐν].[2]

We may conclude, therefore, that Clement, like some early scribes, made slight changes in the text of the New Testament when such changes seemed necessary for a clearer statement of his own doctrine, in this case an early Christian understanding of the relation between the Father and the Son.

John 3:34

The debate in the early church concerning the relation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is again reflected in the textual variants found in the following passage: "For he whom God has sent utters the words of God, for it is not by measure that he gives the Spirit." (RSV) There is some uncertainty as to the subject of the verb (δίδωσιν) in the last clause. "The Spirit" (τὸ πνεῦμα) could well be taken as the subject, in which case the Spirit might be understood as giving the words which the Son utters. This would place the Spirit in the role of a mediator of the divine word spoken by Christ. Such an interpretation might have given offense to some scribes, with the result that "the Spirit" was omitted, as is the case in Codex Vaticanus and Syriac Sinaiticus. It is also possible that some scribes may have taken Jesus as the subject of the clause, but this, like the first suggestion, would introduce an idea which is alien to the passage.[1]

---

[1] See The Motivation of Changes Made in the New Testament by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria: A Study in the Origin of New Testament Variation (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1945), p. 28. Hereafter cited as Titus, Motivation.

[2] R. B. Tollington, Clement of Alexandria (2 vols.; London: Williams and Norgate, 1914), I, 343 f. Cited by Titus, Motivation, p. 28.

Since "God" may be understood as the subject of the verb in this clause, the difficulty was eased by the insertion of ὁ θεός after the verb in some witnesses which attest an early form of the text, including Codices Bezae and Koridethi, together with one Old Latin manuscript (a), the Vulgate, the Coptic Bohairic and Sahidic. This reading is also found in the mass of Byzantine witnesses. Other interesting readings inserted as subject include "the Father" (Syr. cur.) and "God the Father" (Syr. sin.). Most scholars who reject these readings as explanatory additions to the text would, nonetheless, acknowledge that they supply the proper meaning in the passage. Thus "the Spirit" is taken as the object of the verb rather than as subject. It is God who gives the Spirit in full measure to Jesus, who is identified in this passage as "the one whom God has sent." At the same time this reading avoids the suggestion that it is "the Spirit" who gives the divine word to the Son. The translators of the NEB, indicating a desire to express the meaning of this passage so that it might be clearly understood, render the last clause in these words: " . . . so measureless is God's gift of the Spirit."

---

[1] C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1955), p. 189. Hereafter cited as Barrett, *St. John*.

It is sufficient to add that the church's concern for the correct expression of the interrelationships of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit helps to account for the existence of significant variations in this passage.

It is generally acknowledged by most New Testament scholars today that the concept of the Holy Spirit as the third person of the Godhead is not yet developed in the writings of the New Testament. The primitive church understood the Spirit of God as the manifestation of the power and activity of God, which had come upon Jesus at his baptism and was reflected in his works and words. Afterwards, the same Spirit mediated the power and grace of the risen Lord to his disciples and to all who believed on him. The author of Luke-Acts has given us the most complete account of the early church's understanding of the role of the Spirit in the events leading to the birth of Jesus and then as the dynamic of Jesus' ministry, followed by the outpouring of the Spirit upon the nucleus of believers at Pentecost, an experience which gave both power and direction to the mission of the Christian community. Still, the Lukan conception of the Spirit can scarcely be said to include the later idea of full personality. The author of the Gospel of John comes nearer to such an idea in his passages concerning the Paraclete (cf. John 14:25, 15:26, 16:7-15); yet even the Fourth Evangelist thought of the Spirit as proceeding from the Father and as mediating the things of Christ to his disciples while he goes to the Father, and there is little basis for maintaining that he regarded the Spirit as having full personality in the sense that later theologians would unhesitatingly declare.

John 7:39

There are some examples of textual variation in the New Testament which indicate the desire on the part of scribes to express in more adequate terms either the relation between the Spirit and the godhead or the idea of the Spirit as person. One such example is found in John 7:39 which reads, "Now this he said about the Spirit, which those who believed in him were to receive; for as yet the Spirit had not been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified." (RSV) The word "given" is not found in some of the best witnesses (P66^c P75, S, Koridethi and others), where the Greek at this point reads ... οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα ... But this reading could easily lead to misunderstanding. Many scribes were doubtless perplexed as to what such an ambiguous statement could mean. Lest it be taken to affirm that the Spirit was not yet in existence prior to Jesus' glorification, various changes were introduced to avoid a false interpretation. Several important witnesses (a b c e ff^2 g l, Vulgate, Syr. sin, and cur. Eusebius) add the word "given."[1] Others read: " . . . for the Holy Spirit was not yet given . . . " (B 053 254 e q Syr. pal. and hkl.), thus adding "Holy" to "Spirit," in addition to the word "given." Some Western witnesses (D f Goth) have, " . . . for the Holy Spirit was not yet in them." The Coptic Sahidic reads: " . . . for they had not yet received [the] Spirit," and the Bohairic has: " . . . for [the] Spirit had not yet come." The general consensus is that the shortest reading given above best explains the others which tend to make explanatory additions with the aim of providing the correct interpretation of this passage dealing with the Spirit. The word "Holy" which is added to

---

[1] It is impossible to determine whether or not this is the text which lies behind the RSV, which does not employ italics to indicate words not found in the Greek text.

"Spirit" in many witnesses belonging to different textual groups is inserted at other points in the text of the New Testament, perhaps as a means of further identifying the Spirit as divine.

An example of this is found in Acts 11:12a where the Duke New Testament (1780) adds "Holy" to "Spirit" in a passage which reads, "And the Spirit told me to go with them without hesitation." (RSV) Here the scribe of Codex 1780 evidently wished to make it clear that the Spirit which urged Peter to go with the men who had come from Cornelius at Caesarea was not his own spirit but the divine Spirit. Thus it was the Holy Spirit who authorized the bold action of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles.

On the other hand, in I Corinthians 2:11, which refers to the spirit of man in the ordinary text, some Old Latin manuscripts and Codex Boernerianus (G^p) omit "of the man," thus making Paul's question read: "For who among men knows a man's thoughts except the Spirit which is in him?" The omission of this phrase was probably intentional; some scribe wished to attribute such knowledge of man's thoughts to the Spirit of God rather than the spirit of man himself.

Acts 16:7

According to most early witnesses the author of Acts refers to "the Spirit of Jesus" in Acts 16:7, a passage which explains the movements of Paul and his companions by reference to the guidance of the Holy Spirit (vss. 6-7). The reading "Spirit of Jesus" has the support of the most important uncials (S A B C^2 D E), a few minuscules, and most of the versions. However, the name "Jesus" is omitted in the Coptic Sahidic, some Armenian manuscripts, the great majority of the Byzantine manuscripts, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. Still another variant is found in the original hand of Codex Ephraemi, a few other Greek manuscripts, and one Old Latin codex (gig), which have "the Spirit of the Lord."

F.H.A. Scrivener lists this passage along with others which in his opinion contain discrepancies arising from doctrinal preconceptions.[1] It is difficult to explain the omission of the name "Jesus" unless we assume that there was some hesitancy to employ the phrase "the Spirit of Jesus," a phrase which is not used elsewhere by the author of Acts. "The Spirit" or "the Holy Spirit" is more commonly used throughout the New Testament, especially in Luke-Acts. The fact that the scribe of Codex C, or an earlier one, substituted "of the Lord" for "of Jesus" may indicate a preference for a term that appears only in one other passage in Acts, a non-Western reading in Acts 8:39. Here "Spirit of the Lord could refer to the Spirit of God, as so often in the Old Testament, or to the Spirit of Jesus since the title "Lord" is often applied to Jesus in the New Testament. It is certain that many more scribes preferred simply to omit the name "Jesus," thus designating "the Spirit" as the source of guidance for Paul and his companions.

John 14:17

The neuter is usually employed throughout the New Testament in reference to the Spirit or the Holy Spirit, as indicated in the form of the definite article preceding the noun. When the personal pronoun is used, again the neuter form is more often found than the masculine. In John 14:17 some early

---

[1] See his _A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament_ (3rd ed.; Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1883), pp. 17, 620. Hereafter cited as Scrivener, _Plain Introduction_. Here he accepts the reading "the Spirit of Jesus."

Alexandrian witnesses have the personal pronoun in the neuter form (αὐτό) twice in reference to "the Spirit of truth" and the Caesarean and Byzantine texts add a third, also in the neuter. But Codex Bezae, Codex Regius (L), and others read αὐτόν in all three instances, probably because some scribes preferred to use the masculine form when referring to the Holy Spirit. The use of this form suggests the tendency to regard the Spirit as person rather than as simply a power or influence, which might be implied in the use of the neuter form. Whether or not this same alteration is made in other passages involving the Spirit will require further investigation. The Johannine language itself in passages dealing with the Spirit tends to support the idea of the Spirit as person.

John 4:24

The ordinary text of this verse reads: "God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth." (RSV) The context reveals that Jesus is talking with a Samaritan woman concerning the place and manner of true worship. Because of the nature of God, who is spirit, "those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth." But the original hand of Codex Sinaiticus alters the last phrase to read "spirit of truth." Is this a reference to "the Spirit of truth," which is a Johannine phrase designating the divine Spirit (cf. 14:17, 15:26, 16:13)?[1] If so, it may indicate that the scribe of Sinaiticus had difficulty with the meaning of this passage and felt that

---

[1] It has been noted that when the Gospel of John refers to the divine Spirit as "the Spirit of truth," this term always has the articles: τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας . See Kenneth W. Clark, "The Text of the Gospel of John in Third-Century Egypt," Novum Testamentum, V (1962), 20, n. 3.

"spirit" must refer to the Holy Spirit. Thus his alteration would provide a new interpretation which has theological implications, for the text of Sinaiticus could then be translated, " . . . those who worship (omit 'him') must worship by means of (or in) the Spirit of truth." Such an interpretation gives to the Holy Spirit a mediating role between the true worshiper and the Father. True worship is impossible without the Spirit of truth.

I Corinthians 8:6

A few passages in the New Testament contain textual variants which appear to have been introduced with the aim of providing additional support for the doctrine of the Trinity or perfecting the incomplete statements of New Testament writers. One such variant is found in I Corinthians 8:6 where almost all witnesses read: "Yet for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist." (RSV) In this context Paul is contrasting his own view (and that of the primitive church) that there is one God and one Lord, over against the more common view held by pagans at Corinth and elsewhere that there are many "gods" and many "lords." Paul's words are a positive affirmation of monotheism with a definite Christian interpretation in which Jesus Christ is designated as Lord and the Mediator of all creation. A similar view is expressed in the Logos Christology in John 1:3 and the role of the Son in Hebrews 1:2.

This affirmation by Paul must have appeared incomplete in the minds of certain scribes and fathers. Because it does not mention the Holy Spirit, the conclusion might have been drawn that Paul's words in this passage gave support to a binitarian view of the Godhead. It was probably as a result of the controversy which raged for some time after the fourth century concerning the doctrine of the Trinity that an addition was made in some manuscripts at the end of Paul's statement in verse 6 which reads, "and one Holy Spirit, in whom are all things."[1] A few witnesses (0142 460 et al.) apparently make a more complete affirmation of the doctrine of the Trinity by adding, "and one Holy Spirit, in whom are all things and we in him." At the same time this last reading rounds out Paul's sentence, making it a perfectly balanced creedal statement on the Trinity, which would have satisfied many readers of the text that Paul taught what the church later believed concerning the Triune God. Such a reading as this would lend support and authority to the creedal formulas which resulted from efforts of the fathers to state correctly and forthrightly the convictions of the faithful concerning the doctrine of God.

I John 5:7-8

There are few passages in the New Testament which offer any support to a doctrine of the Trinity as it was later propounded by the fathers of the church. If the documents which the church accepted as Scripture had been more explicit on the subject of the Trinity, there might have been far less controversy and speculation on this important matter. One passage which must have lent itself to the possibility of alteration in support of the doctrine of the Triune God is the famous "three heavenly witnesses" text in I John 5:7-8, which reads: "There are three witnesses, the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree." (RSV, vs. 8) This reading is supported by almost all the Greek codices, the early Greek fathers, all early versions, and the older manuscripts of the Vulgate. Another reading, which is found in the later manuscripts of the Vulgate and in one Old Latin codex, the pseudo-Augustine Speculum (m), and is quoted by several late fathers in the West, is as follows:

---

[1] 55.72**.109. 178, supported by Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil, and Cyril of Alexandria. According to Tischendorf, Chrysostom argues against the reading.

> There are three which bear witness on earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood and these three are one in Christ Jesus; and there are three which bear witness in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Spirit and these three are one.

According to A. E. Brooke this reading first appears in the Latin text of I John 5:7-8 as cited by a Spanish writer, Priscillian, who lived in the fourth century.[1] W. F. Howard states unequivocally that the notorious passage originated in Spain and was soon found in Africa and that it can be dated in the second half of the fourth century.[2] Finally, the passage appeared in the Sistine and the Clementine editions (sixteenth century) of the Vulgate in a slightly different form, the heavenly witnesses being mentioned before the witnesses on earth. In this same form it is found in two Greek minuscules of c. A.D. 1500 (61 629), and is added in the margin of another (88). The passage also appears in the Greek text of the Complutensian Polyglot. It was this form which Erasmus included in the third edition of his Greek text of the New Testament after making a rash promise that he would insert the passage in any future editions if he were shown one Greek manuscript which supported it. Such a manuscript was found--or was prepared; whereupon Erasmus inserted the passage in his third edition, but with serious reservations, and withdrew it from the fourth edition.[1] Thus it became a part of what was later called the *Textus Receptus*, which was the basic text underlying the earlier English translations, including the King James Version. When the English Revised Version of the New Testament was published in 1881, this passage now known as the *Comma Johanneum*, was omitted without so much as a footnote. This, along with other decisions of the translators, prompted a storm of criticism from conservative scholars who felt that the new translation, together with its Greek base, was tainted with sceptical tendencies.

---

[1] See his excellent treatment of this passage in A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles ("ICC"; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), pp. 154-165.

[2] Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine," p. 9.

The *Comma Johanneum* was evidently regarded as an important passage among the later Latin theologians. Here they found proof that the doctrine of the Trinity, which was only implicitly present in the New Testament, was actually stated in the text.[2] The passage became so well known and accepted in the Roman Church as a part of the text of I John that its authenticity was vouched for by the Holy Office in Rome in 1897, holding that it was not safe to deny that these words are part of the sacred text of St. John's Epistle.[3]

No scholar would have been inclined to deny the authenticity of the *Comma Johanneum* if the evidence were not so clearly against its inclusion. On the other hand, Protestants and Catholics alike would not have been sensitive about its omission from editions of the Bible if it did not involve a doctrinal matter of great significance to the whole Church.

---

[1] Metzger, *Text*, p. 101.

[2] R. M. Grant, *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963), p. 48. Hereafter cited as Grant, *Introduction*.

[3] In the Catholic edition of the RSV the *Comma* has not been added to the text, but it is noted in Appendix I that the *Vulgate* includes this passage. Recent Catholic textual scholars, including Bover, Merk, and Vogels, omitted the *Comma* from the Greek text of their bilingual editions, but included it in the *text* of the Latin Vulgate.

The original text of I John 5:7-8 is concerned with the place of the Spirit and the sacraments in giving testimony to the reality of the Incarnation. The fact that the text mentions three witnesses which agree may have suggested the possibility of interpreting these words along trinitarian lines.[1]

Matthew 28:19

For a long time in the history of the church the text of I John 5:7-8 shared with Matthew 28:19 the burden of providing scriptural evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity. Its use as a proof text in support of that doctrine was finally discredited by textual scholars in the nineteenth century. But there was still one important passage which was widely regarded as a basis for the trinitarian affirmation of the church as well as the sacrament of baptism. The words of this text are attributed to the risen Lord in Matthew 28:19: "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. . . . (RSV) There is little inclination among modern scholars to regard this verse in its present form as reporting the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus. It is widely held that these words reflect the language of the church at the time when this Gospel was written. Yet they remain for many a reminder of the faith of the church and a call to witness to that faith.

However, there is a significant variation in this verse as cited by Eusebius of Caesarea. F. C. Conybeare, in an article which appeared in the first volume of The Hibbert Journal (1902-03) called attention to the fact that Eusebius cites this passage (vss. 19-20) eighteen times in the following form: "Go ye and make disciples of all the nations in my name, teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I commanded you."[1] Conybeare offers convincing evidence to show that this was the form of the text which Eusebius found in the ancient codices with which he was familiar. The number of his citations of this passage, either in the form quoted above or in a simpler form ending at the word "nations," has since been increased to twenty-five, while only two doubtful citations of the more familiar reading have been found in Eusebius' writings.[2] Despite the fact that no manuscript evidence has yet been found in support of the variant cited by Eusebius, there is a strong possibility that other witnesses contained the shorter reading. W. F. Howard stated the situation in these words:

---

[1] Amos N. Wilder, "The First, Second, and Third Epistles of John: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, edited by G. A. Buttrick, *et al.* (12 vols.; New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1956), XII, 294.

> Even if the two rather doubtful exceptions were able to prove that Eusebius was aware of another reading, we could not lightly dismiss as meaningless the fact that so learned a Christian scholar, writing in one of the greatest Christian libraries of the age, when Christological controversy was at its height, would quote the great commission as he almost invariably does unless that form of the text was the one with which he was the more familiar.[3]

Kirsopp Lake also pointed to the text of Matthew 28:19-20 as cited by Eusebius in his attempt to prove that there was a scribal tendency in the early church to add references to baptism in the text of the New Testament.[4] Lake also states his opinion, based upon a study of the relevant passages in the writings of Justin Martyr, that the standard reading of Matthew 28:19 was not in the text of the Gospel used by the Apologist. Still, the burden of proof rests upon those who prefer the Eusebian form of the text as the original in view of the overwhelming support for the usual reading. It is sufficient to point out that the shorter reading is found in several works by Eusebius written over a period of at least a quarter of a century, and this at a time when baptismal creeds were in use which employed the trinitarian expression. We shall deal with the question of the liturgical usages of the early church as related to this passage at a later point in this study. Here we simply call attention to the fact that the Triune Name appears in connection with baptism only at this point in the New Testament. Elsewhere the evidence suggests that baptism in the early church was administered "in the name of Jesus Christ" or "in the name of the Lord Jesus."[1]

---

[1] Conybeare, "Modifications," p. 104.

[2] Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine," pp. 10 f. [3] Ibid.

[4] Lake, The Influence of Textual Criticism, pp. 8 ff.

The existence of the variant reading cited by Eusebius alongside the more familiar reading in Matthew 28:19 makes it amply clear that a theological issue is involved in the choice of readings. It is a known fact that the trinitarian formula in the more familiar form of the text was used in support of the doctrine of the Trinity as early as the fourth century. The alternative reading provides no such reference to which theologians could appeal to bolster their defense of this doctrine. This consideration may help to account for the fact that the latter reading received so little attention in the early church, other than in the writings of Eusebius.[2]

There are other passages in the New Testament containing variant

---

1. Acts 2:38, 10:48; Gal. 3:27; Rom. 6:3; cf. Acts 8:16, 19:5.

2. F. C. Conybeare offers the suggestion that the original text ended at the word "nations" and that three rival endings developed independently, viz.: (1) "in my name," in Justin, Eusebius, and others; (2) "and they shall believe in me," in Aphraates, representing the Old Syriac version; (3) the familiar form in Theodotus, Tertullian, the Latin version of Irenaeus and the surviving Greek MSS. ("Modifications," p. 108)

readings which involve differences in interpretation of the nature of God. Some of these variants reflect ideas about God which circulated as a result of the widespread influence of Marcion, the second-century heretic. We should not expect to find many such variants in our extant manuscripts because of the tendency of later scribes to guard against the inclusion of readings which were believed to have arisen in heretical circles. Nevertheless, a few variations of this kind may yet be found, especially in the so-called "Western" text.

Ephesians 4:6

The author of Ephesians made a strong plea for the unity of the church. The basis for this unity is set forth in Ephesians 4:4-6. The last verse of this passage reads: " . . . one God and Father of all, who is above all and through all and in all." The whole text of verses 4-6 reads like a creedal statement. It is certainly an affirmation of the church's faith in one Spirit, one Lord, one God. In verse 6, which refers to "one God and Father," there is no suggestion in the text of the Alexandrian and Caesarean witnesses that the sphere of God's sovereign power and presence is in any way limited to believers alone. Yet in several important Western and Byzantine witnesses the word ἡμιν is added at the end of the verse.[1] The pronoun could have been in the original text of this verse, but there is good reason to suspect that it was added by a reviser at an early stage in the transmission of the text. Harnack sees in this passage an example of Marcionite influence on the text of non-Marcionite manuscripts.[1] It is certain that the variant can be dated early in the second century in view of its widespread support in early Western witnesses, including Marcion. The fact that it is not found in the more important Alexandrian and Caesarean manuscripts, together with the suggestion that it bears the marks of a tendentious alteration, makes it appear likely that it was an early addition to the text. E. C. Blackman thinks that Marcion added the pronoun in this passage "in order to exclude the possibility of his God being thought of as pervading the universe."[2]

---

[1] The witnesses include D E F G K L, the Old Latin d e f g (nobis), the Old Syriac version, Marcion, Irenaeus, Cyprian, and the Vulgate.

We have already suggested the possibility that the addition of the pronoun in this passage affects the interpretation of it. The passage without the addition affirms the belief in "one God and Father," whose relationship to all creation or to all men is seen in the fact that he is "above all and through all and in all."[3] On the other hand, the addition of the pronoun ἡμῖν suggests that God's unique relation to men (or the universe) is limited to *us*, meaning Christian believers. Such an interpretation might have been well received by those who conceived of God's relationship to men or to the universe primarily in terms of his presence in the lives of those who make up the body of Christ.

A few Byzantine witnesses read "you" (ὑμῖν) at the end of this verse. This is the reading in the *Textus Receptus*, which is reflected in the KJV. It was known to Chrysostom (d. 407) and Theodoret (d. 457); thus its origin is probably not earlier than the fourth century. Like the reading cited above, it must be regarded as an interpretative addition to the text which has theological implications, for it has the effect of limiting the divine presence to those to whom this text was understood to be addressed, viz., the church. On the other hand, it may simply reflect the use of ὑμῶν in verse 4.

---

[1] *Marcion*, p. 154*, cited by Blackman, *Marcion*, p. 168.

[2] Blackman, *Marcion*, p. 45.

[3] The word "all" (πάντων, πᾶσιν) in this verse is probably to be understood in the context as masculine, although it is possible to construe πάντων as neuter.

Romans 1:18

According to Harnack (Marcion, p. 103*), Marcion made a significant alteration in the text of this verse. The original form of the text almost certainly referred to the "wrath of God" but Marcion omitted θεοῦ , probably for doctrinal reasons. He evidently regarded the word as an insertion made by someone who identified the good God revealed in Jesus Christ with the God of wrath who had revealed himself to the Jews. To Marcion the good God could not be angry. The remainder of this chapter in Romans (1:19-32) was also omitted by Marcion, "doubtless because God is said to have given men over to crimes as a punishment."[1] He believed instead that the prerogative of judgment belonged to the Creator.

It should be noted that the omission of "God" in verse 18 is attested in certain minuscules (876* and 1908). We cannot say whether or not this variation is to be attributed to Marcionite influence, but the omission in these manuscripts is an interesting phenomenon in view of its agreement with the text of Marcion at this point. Perhaps this is to be explained as a scribal error, but we cannot rule out the possibility of Marcionite influence. In any case the alteration involves a theological revision in interpretation.

---

[1] Blackman, Marcion, p. 45.

Revelation 15:3

The song of praise in Revelation 15, ascribed to the company of martyrs who have conquered the beast, begins:

> Great and wonderful are thy deeds,
> O Lord God the Almighty!
> Just and true are thy ways,
> O King of the *ages*. (RSV)

There is a variant reading in the last line which is of interest to us in that it suggests a different sphere of God's sovereignty. A few witnesses read "nations" (ἐθνῶν) in place of "ages."[1]

The NEB translators followed the reading "King of the ages." It is reported that they favored this reading probably for two reasons: (1) the use of the phrase "King of the ages" in 1 Timothy 1:17; (2) the presence of ἔθνη in verse 4 may have suggested the reading "King of the nations."[2] The text of Westcott and Hort reads "nations" although they regarded the alternative reading as of approximately equal validity. Nestle followed the choice of Westcott and Hort, apparently regarding "King of the ages" as a phrase drawn from 1 Timothy 1:17.

The KJV has still another reading which is found in a few late Byzantine manuscripts--"King of saints." Although the latter has little claim to represent the original form of the text, it may be understood as a further attempt to define the particular sphere of the divine sovereignty or kingship.

These three forms of the text of Revelation 15:3 agree in ascribing to God the role of king, a title which is frequently applied to God in the Old Testament, especially in liturgical passages, to which there are several parallels in this hymn of praise. Yet these variations in the text offer different interpretations of the province of God's rule. Each of them draws upon a particular understanding of the nature of God. If God is the King whose rule never ends, he is therefore the eternal King or the "King of the ages." If God calls nations into being and brings them to judgment, he is "King of the nations." If he calls men to receive his righteous rule and fulfills his holy purpose in their lives, he is the "King of saints." Each of these interpretations is in agreement with some aspect of the Biblical understanding of God, yet each provides only a partial view of that understanding. It is hardly necessary to add that the variant readings in this passage involve three different insights into the nature of God.

---

[1] These include A P 046.051 1 82.2059 and one Old Latin MS (gig). αἰώνων is found in P47 S*C, the Latin Vulgate and the Old Syriac version.

[2] R.V.G. Tasker, *The Greek New Testament* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 444.

Luke 10:21

"In that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit and said, 'I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and understanding and revealed them to babes. . . .'" (RSV)

There are two omissions in this verse in the text of Marcion's Gospel, which are also attested in other witnesses.[1] The fact that "Father" is omitted by Marcion and by one Old Latin manuscript (a) has led E. C. Blackman to conclude that Marcionite influence accounts for this reading in the Old Latin Codex Vercellensis.[2] Although Blackman regards this omission as a possible tendentious alteration by Marcion (see pp. 156 f.), it is difficult to see his reasons for this, for later in the same passage the text of Marcion reads "Father" in agreement with all other witnesses.[3]

---

[1] Harnack, Marcion, pp. 205* f. [2] Blackman, Marcion, p. 136.

[3] Harnack, Marcion, p. 206*.

More important is Marcion's omission of καὶ τῆς γῆς ("and earth") in this verse. It is likely that Marcion objected to these words because of what they imply concerning God's relation to the world. According to Marcion, the Strange God who was revealed in Jesus Christ did not create the world; hence, it would be improper for Jesus to address him as "Lord of heaven and earth." He is, of course, Lord of heaven, but not of the earth. Instead the world was created by a demigod, whom the Jews worship as a result of his revelation to them in their law and their prophets. That the good God should be addressed as Lord of earth would be unthinkable in view of his nature as one who is hidden in mystery, far above all other powers and all created things.

There is one important manuscript which omits these same words--"and the earth." It is the third-century Chester Beatty manuscript of the Gospels and Acts, P45. We cannot be certain that the omission is to be attributed to Marcionite influence. The most that can be said is that the two witnesses agree at this point and that in Marcion the alteration is probably motivated by theological considerations. It is unlikely that Marcion and P45 have preserved the original reading; therefore, both witnesses must represent an altered form of the text.

Involved in these two alternative readings in the text of Luke 10:21 are two basically different conceptions of God in relation to the world--the Hebraic and the Gnostic. Early Christianity was influenced by both of these views, but where Jesus Christ was understood to have fulfilled the revelation of God in the Old Testament, as interpreted historically, the church favored the Hebraic view. Marcion rejected the Old Testament as alien to the revelation of God in Jesus Christ and the Gnostics interpreted the Jewish Scriptures allegorically if they accepted them at all. Leaders of the church gradually recognized that the Gnostic and Marcionite views of God must be rejected, for they led to a distortion of the tradition as represented in certain centers of Christian influence.

We may therefore conclude that the reading in Luke 10:21 which omits "and the earth" would be more congenial to the Gnostic or Marcionite frame of mind, while the inclusion of this phrase would not offend those Christians whose understanding of God was rooted in a more Hebraic mode of thought.

Thus far we have discussed the significance of particular variants for the bearing which they have upon the Christian understanding of the nature of God. There are likewise variations in the text of the New Testament which concern the role of God as Creator, Sustainer, and Judge. Our treatment of some of these variants will indicate among other things the concern of those who transmitted the text for the correct statement of God's action in relation to the world and to men.

Romans 8:28

"We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him, who are called according to his purpose." (RSV) This translation of Romans 8:28 suggests a different meaning from the more familiar reading--"all things work for good"--which is found in the KJV. The difference in translation is based in part upon a difference in the Greek text. Some important ancient witnesses read ὁ θεὸς after συνεργεῖ, and it is this form of the text which is translated in the RSV.[1] Lachmann (1831) and Westcott and Hort (1881) put this reading into their text although the latter placed ὁ θεὸς in brackets to indicate some doubt as to the original reading. Tischendorf omitted it in his eighth edition, probably because it was not found in Codex Sinaiticus.

---

[1] Witnesses which attest this reading include P46 B A, Copt. sah. and sometimes Origen. ὁ θεὸς is not found in Codices A C D G, Clement, and most Byzantine witnesses.

It is possible that ὁ θεὸς was a later addition to the text and that the subject of the verb may be understood to be the "Spirit," which is the theme of Paul's discussion in verses 26-27. This was apparently the reasoning behind the translation of this verse in the NEB,[1] which reads, "and in everything, as we know, he co-operates for good with those who love God. . . ." Another possibility in translating the shorter text is to assume that "God" is the intended subject, in which case one would translate, "He (that is, God) co-operates in all things." A third alternative is to make "all things" (πάντα) the subject of the verb, which as we have seen, is the reading in the KJV. In his commentary on Romans, C. K. Barrett indicates his preference for this way of rendering the shorter form of the Greek text.[2]

Whichever form of the text is regarded as the original, it is evident that the longer and shorter readings in the Greek text may imply two different theological views concerning the actual manner in which the "good" is understood to be obtained. Either the good is realized by the fact that "in everything God works with those who love him" or it comes about because "everything works for good with those who love God." The latter has been attacked on the grounds that it attributes to Paul an evolutionary optimism which is foreign to his thought.[1] It is certainly true that the form of the text which makes "God" the subject provides a more personal interpretation of providential help in the lives of those who are God's elect. The alternative reading has too often served as the basis for a passive acceptance of events and circumstances with the assurance that "all will be well in the end," as though the outcome were achieved through a more or less automatic course of development.

---

[1] Tasker, The Greek New Testament, p. 434.

[2] C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans ("Harper's New Testament Commentaries"; New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1957), pp. 161, 169. Hereafter cited as Barrett, Epistle to the Romans.

Although Origen was aware of both readings in this passage, he understood the text to mean that God "unites completely with the good man to will and joins with him to make that will effective, for 'in everything he works for good with those who love God.'" (Commentary on John xx:23)[2]

II Thessalonians 2:13

"But we are bound to give thanks to God . . . because God chose you *from the beginning* to be saved . . . ." (RSV) The underlined words in this passage are based upon the reading in a number of important witnesses of the text.[3] But other witnesses of equal importance attest a different reading (ἀπαρχήν in place of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς), which could be translated "because God chose you as the firstfruits."[4] Westcott and Hort chose this reading though they recognized that the alternative was equally possible. Nestle also adopted this reading while Tischendorf preferred the alternative.

---

[1] Barrett, *Epistle to the Romans*, p. 169.

[2] Clark, "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," p. 57.

[3] These include Codices Sinaiticus, Laurensis, Bezae, many Byzantine MSS, some Old Latin codices, Copt. sah. and the Syr. pesh.

[4] The RSV mg. translates, "as the first converts." This reading is attested in Codices B G 33 1739, the Latin Vulgate, the Copt. boh. and Syr. hkl.

It is difficult to decide between these two readings on the basis of external evidence. Hence, most translators and commentators apparently make their decision by seeking to determine which reading suits the context better or which agrees more fully with Paul's thinking. R.V.G. Tasker reports that the NEB translators chose ἀπ' ἀρχῆς "on the ground that thanksgiving for the divine election of his converts 'from the beginning of time' followed by thanksgiving for this divine call (verse 14) seemed in keeping with Paul's thought."[1]

On the other hand Paul elsewhere refers to particular persons or households in certain areas as the firstfruits or first converts in those regions (cf. Rom. 16:5; I Cor. 16:15). But here he does not have in mind a single individual or household but the whole body of Christians at Thessalonica. Furthermore, the context of verses 14-15 would seem to require the reading, "from the beginning." James Everett Frame speaks of this passage as a word of encouragement to the fainthearted, in which Paul sees God's work of salvation from everlasting to everlasting (cf. Rom. 8:28-30).[2] In a critical note on the same passage Frame argued that the reading ἀπ' ἀρχῆς suits Paul's purpose of encouraging the fainthearted better than ἀπαρχήν.[3] He also regarded the former reading as more difficult and therefore more likely the original in view of the fact that it is nowhere else used by Paul.

That these two alternative readings in the text of II Thessalonians 2:13 affect the interpretation of this verse would seem obvious. One of them affirms the conviction that believers are chosen by God "from the beginning of time." Their salvation has already been assured by the fact that God chose them before they were born or before the creation of the world. At the present time he calls them through the gospel (verse 14). To be sure, their salvation is made available "through consecration by the Spirit" and their "belief in the truth"; yet the goal of obtaining it can already be anticipated.

---

[1] *The Greek New Testament*, p. 440.

[2] *Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians* ("ICC"; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), p. 279.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 280.

The variant which describes the Thessalonians as "firstfruits" has been interpreted in at least three ways:[1] (1) the Thessalonians as firstfruits are consecrated to God as over against the mass of "the doomed"; (2) the Thessalonians or Macedonians are firstfruits "contrasted with others yet to follow" as in I Cor. 15:20; or (3) the Thessalonians are consecrated for a possession (James 1:18, Rev. 14:4), and are, along with other Christians in churches established by Paul, a kind of firstfruits from paganism. Thus the most striking thing about this reading is that it adds a new dimension of meaning to the passage, which is not entirely suited to the context.

Matthew 25:41

"Then he will say to those at his left hand, 'Depart from me, you cursed, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels.'" (RSV) The word "prepared" in this verse translates an aorist passive participle (ἡτοιμασμένον), a form which is used elsewhere to refer to God's preparation of persons or things in advance (cf. vs. 34). Although God is mentioned in some passages in the New Testament as the One by whom something is prepared (as in Revelation 12:6), the passive form of the verb alone was more often used, perhaps out of deference to the deity.

---

[1] I am indebted for these suggestions to J. E. Frame, whose work is cited above.

This manner of expressing the preparatory work of God was capable of misinterpretation, especially in a passage like Matthew 25:41. Here the preparation of the eternal fire could be attributed to a demi-god, one whose role was that of creator of the world and judge of unspiritual men.

But there is an alternate reading in which the aorist active verb is used and which must be translated "that my Father has prepared."[1] This alteration of the text may be nothing more than an explanatory gloss introduced by some editor of the early Western text, but if the reading be seen against the background of the Gnostic belief that the Father of Jesus is not the creator of the material world in which the souls of men are hopelessly imprisoned until delivered through gnosis revealed by a redeemer, then this variant may be an affirmation of the Father's role as Creator in contradiction of the Gnostic view. This reading makes it quite clear that the role of Creator and Judge of men and angels belongs to the Father of Jesus Christ. Thus it prevents the passage from being used by such as the Gnostics who would assign this role to a lesser deity than the God who sent Jesus Christ into the world.

John 1:3, 4

It is generally known that the punctuation which is found in modern editions of the Greek text, as well as in certain manuscripts, versions and fathers, is capable of representing important changes in the meaning of specific passages. One such problem passage is found in John 1:3, 4, which may be translated: "[A]ll things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life. . . ." (RSV) This translation follows the well-known reading, which is represented in most modern editions of the Greek text,[1] and which has generally been preferred by interpreters of the text since the fourth century. The part of the passage in Greek which is relevant to our discussion reads: χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν. The above translation places a full stop after γέγονεν . Another alternative is to place a full stop after οὐδὲ ἕν , which would then be translated: "[W]ithout him nothing was made. That which has been made was life in him." This reading represents the interpretation which the earliest fathers (and heretics) placed upon the passage.[2]

---

[1] This reading is found in D fam. 1 22, Old Latin witnesses, Justin, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Pseudo-Clement.

Some early Greek manuscripts include punctuation at this point, e.g., the Washington Codex and P75. Both of them support the second reading, and though they may not represent the original text, they do offer corroborative evidence of an early interpretation of this passage.[3] Additional evidence supporting this early interpretation is found in some Old Latin manuscripts (b e f), the Old Syriac, and the Sahidic version, all of which attest a tradition as early as the second or third century. As was stated above, the most ancient writers who cited this passage did so in the form which would place the full stop after ἕν .

---

[1] E.g., the Nestle-Aland text (25th edition, 1964).

[2] Barrett, St. John, pp. 130 f.

[3] Calvin L. Porter, "A Textual Analysis of the Earliest Greek Manuscripts of the Gospel of John" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1961), p. 189. Hereafter cited as Porter, "Textual Analysis."

The reading which places the full stop after γέγονεν was not widely known until Chrysostom, who favored it and declared the other reading to be heretical. He argued against the use of the latter, probably because he saw that it was being used by the heretics to support their views. Since Chrysostom the reading which he preferred has well nigh held the field though some modern scholars have argued in favor of the reading which is supported by most early writers.[1] It has been argued that the reading which makes the full stop after γέγονεν was used by later orthodox writers in order to refute the suggestion by Origen that "all things" created through the Logos included the Holy Spirit. Maurice F. Wiles declares that the horror of such an interpretation of this passage "seems to have been largely influential in determining the punctuation finally adopted in the text of the Gospel itself."[2] Earlier orthodox writers had found it necessary to insist on the fullest possible meaning of the word "all" in John 1:3 in their controversy with the Gnostics. Since Origen included the Holy Spirit, this point had to be refuted by later orthodox writers.[3] Chrysostom was aware of this interpretation and for this reason exhorted his readers (Homily V) to abandon the reading which would permit such an exegesis of the passage. One can readily see why the earlier attested reading would gradually be supplanted by one that was considered safer as an interpretation of the creative role of the Logos in respect to the Holy Spirit. "Without him was not anything made that was made" was considered preferable because it made clear that the author of the Fourth Gospel was speaking of all created things and not all things absolutely.[1]

---

[1] See, e.g., W. F. Howard, "The Gospel According to St. John: Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick, et al. (12 vols.; New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952), VIII, 465. Cf. Barrett, St. John, pp. 13 f., who states the arguments for both readings, but prefers the more traditional one.

[2] Maurice F. Wiles, The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1960), p. 103.

[3] Ibid.

Acts 20:28

"Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians, to feed the church of the Lord which he obtained with his own blood." (RSV)

There is a significant variation in this passage which is reflected in the margin of the RSV. Instead of reading "church of the Lord" some ancient witnesses (including Vaticanus, Sinaiticus and the Vulgate) read "church of God."[2] Hort preferred the latter on the grounds that scribes would be more likely to change θεοῦ to κυρίου than the reverse, in view of what follows.[3] It is quite possible that an early reviser of the text made this change because of the daring implication in the words "with his own (i.e., God's) blood." Hort suggests that "the fear of sanctioning language that might easily be construed in a 'Monarchian' or, in later times, a 'Monophysite' sense would outweigh any other doctrinal impulse."[4] This interpretation could be avoided by giving emphasis to τοῦ ἰδίου and translating the last phrase "the blood of his Own," meaning the blood of Jesus, but the possibility of altering the text to read "Lord" in place of "God" must have appealed to a greater number of scribes and interpreters.[1]

---

[1] Wiles, *The Spiritual Gospel*, p. 103.

[2] The latter reading (θεοῦ) is supported by S B 218 257 383 459 614 *al.*, Vulgate, Syr. hkl., Basil, Ambrose, Epiphanius, Cyril of Alexandria. The former (κυρίου) is attested by P^{74} A C* D E^{a} Ψ 33 181 209 307 337 *al.*, gig, Copt. sah. and boh., Syr hkl. mg. the Armenian, Irenaeus (lat.), Didymus, Lucifer.

[3] Hort, *Introduction*, Appendix, pp. 98 f. For a list of scholars favoring one or the other of these two readings see Metzger, *Text*, p. 236, n. 2.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 98.

It is possible to argue that "Lord" was the original reading in view of its attestation in widely separated areas; yet most witnesses which attest this reading are typically Western, while the alternative may be said to be the Alexandrian reading, so that a final judgment will be based largely on internal considerations. In this regard B. M. Metzger has suggested two arguments in favor of θεοῦ as the original reading: (a) θεοῦ is the more difficult reading; (b) it is more likely to have been altered during the Arian controversy involving the Person of Christ.[2]

F.H.A. Scrivener includes this variation in Acts 20:28 in his brief list of passages containing readings which probably arose from doctrinal considerations.[3] He preferred the reading of the Received Text, which differs from the majority of Byzantine manuscripts in that the latter represent a conflation of the two early readings "Lord" and "God." Noting that the early witnesses are about equally divided, Scrivener likewise suggests that internal evidence must decide the critic's choice.[1] His own view is that the reading "Lord" was introduced into the text at this point in place of "God" because "it tends to point more distinctly to the Divine Person indicated in the passage."[2]

---

[1] Hort thought it possible that the original text may have read "church of God which he obtained by the blood of his own *son*." While this is altogether possible, the text could have this meaning without the word "son." It has been suggested that "his Own" was a title which early Christians gave to Jesus. (See Metzger, Text, p. 236; G.H.C. Macgregor, "The Acts of the Apostles: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible,* edited by G. A. Buttrick, *et al*. (12 vols.; New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954), IX, 273. Hereafter cited as Macgregor, "The Acts of the Apostles."

[2] Metzger, *Text*, p. 235.

[3] *Plain Introduction*, pp. 17, 620-23.

We conclude, therefore, that while there would be little objection to altering the text to read "Lord" in this verse, there is no apparent reason why it should have been altered to read "God." Moreover, the latter reading would have been offensive to many early Christians who could not bear the suggestion that God had obtained the church "with his own blood," which is the more natural meaning of the last clause in this verse. It is for this reason that the two readings may be said to offer two different theological points of view.

The Record of Revelation

One aspect of the early Christian understanding of God involves their concern with the question of divine revelation and the witness to that revelation as recorded in scripture. Although this subject of the Scriptures as the written Word of God deserves to be treated in a separate chapter, the paucity of textual variants found which are related to the church's views of revelation, inspiration and canonicity prompted the writer to discuss the passages containing these variants at the conclusion of this chapter on the doctrine of God.

There is abundant evidence in the New Testament to indicate that the earliest Christians leaned heavily upon the witness of "the Law and the

---

[1] Scrivener, Plain Introduction, p. 622.

[2] Ibid.

Prophets" to support their claim that Jesus is the Christ and that his coming into the world represents a final disclosure of the divine revelation to men. While the memory of Jesus of Nazareth was still fresh in the minds of those who were witnesses of his ministry there was little need to speculate about his role as the fulfillment of the Scriptures, but as the church was soon made up largely of those who had not seen the Lord, tradition and scripture rapidly became the sources to which the church appealed in support of its proclamation. Gradually the tradition concerning Jesus assumed certain established forms. Some of these in turn were collected and finally written down to become the Gospels or written testimonies to the significance of the Christ event. Meanwhile the testimony of apostles to this event was likewise treasured and any writings which were thought to have been written by these men were certain to be received with favor. Thus the nucleus of the New Testament had its beginning and the eventual outcome was the formation of the church's New Testament canon of scripture.

The earliest Christians were already persuaded that "the Law and the Prophets" were divinely inspired sources of revelation, the meaning of which was finally made clear in the light of the revelation in Christ.[1] Since the primitive church owed much to the life and practices of the synagogue, it was only natural that the Jewish Scriptures should become the Bible of the church and since a new and final revelation was believed to have been disclosed in Jesus Christ, the witness to that revelation, once it was set forth in a form acceptable to the church, was certain to be regarded as of equal importance to the Jewish Scriptures. Thus the Old and New Testaments were eventually to take their place together as inspired writings both of which were understood to provide an authentic witness to Jesus Christ.

---

[1] See, e.g., II Cor. 3:14-16.

Another result of this development of the canon may be seen in the fact that the Scriptures were regarded in orthodox circles as the deposit of the faith, to which appeal might be made in defense of the truth against all forms of heresy. Thus the Scriptures were to occupy an important place in bearing testimony to God's revelation to man, and in the minds of many churchmen they would embody that revelation in written form as the Word of God. The authority which was formerly attributed only to the words of lawgivers and prophets was now applied to the whole body of writings held sacred by the church. Evidence of this growing appreciation, and even reverence, for the Scriptures may be seen within the New Testament itself,[1] but it is likewise found in certain variations attributable to those who transmitted the text of the New Testament. Examples of such variants are seen to relate to the church's views of canonicity.

Luke 1:3

In the prologue to the Gospel of Luke the author employs a classical literary technique and style to introduce his work and to explain the purpose and intent of his writing. Because many others had attempted to narrate the tradition and because he had carefully scrutinized the information which had come to his attention, he decided to compose an account for the benefit of Theophilus. "It seemed good to me also," he declares, " . . . to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus." (RSV) Some Old Latin manuscripts (b g^1 q) and the Gothic version have the words, "and to the Holy Spirit," inserted after "me" in this verse, so that these witnesses read: "It seemed good to me and to the Holy Spirit to write . . . ." The motive for this addition does not appear to be primarily a desire to exalt the place of the Holy Spirit, but to indicate the fact that Luke's decision to compose a Gospel was confirmed by the Holy Spirit. His decision to write was not merely his own; it was sanctioned by divine authority.

---

[1] Cf. II Tim. 3:15-16, II Peter 3:15-16.

This variant was not likely introduced at an early stage in the transmission of the text for it does not appear in several Old Latin witnesses which attest the earliest form of this version.[1] By the time it became a part of the text in the West, the Gospel of Luke had long since been recognized as one of the four Gospels included in the New Testament canon. Therefore, what this addition to Luke 1:3 does is to provide evidence in the text itself that the Third Evangelist wrote not a mere human document but one whose origin was inspired by the same Holy Spirit who moved both prophets and apostles to declare the oracles of God.

Matthew 2:17

This verse in the Gospel of Matthew introduces a quotation from the book of Jeremiah. It is typical of many such passages throughout this Gospel which represent the Evangelist's attempt to show that Jesus Christ has fulfilled the predictions of the prophets. In this case, the slaughter of the infants in Bethlehem and the surrounding region is seen as the fulfillment of Jeremiah's words concerning "Rachel weeping for her children." (Jeremiah 31:15) Thus the Evangelist introduces the quotation, "Then was fulfilled what was spoken by the prophet Jeremiah . . . ." (RSV)

There is a significant addition in this verse in Codex Bezae and at least three other manuscripts. These witnesses insert the phrase "by the

---

[1] The earliest witness referred to above, Codex Veronensis (b), is of European origin and was written in the fifth century.

Lord" (ὑπὸ κυρίου) before the phrase "by (διὰ) the prophet Jeremiah," thus making the words of Matthew read: "Then was fulfilled what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet Jeremiah." Such an understanding of this verse may have been intended by the author of the Gospel, but the scribe of Codex Bezae, or perhaps an earlier one, wished to make clear that the words attributed to Jeremiah were "spoken by the Lord." They were not merely the words of a man, nor even those of a revered prophet, but the divine words mediated through the prophet Jeremiah. This divine word "spoken by the Lord" was now fulfilled in the events which centered around the birth of Jesus. Thus in transmitting the text of this verse the scribe has provided an interpretation of the original text by emphasizing the divine origin of the words of Jeremiah. Just as "Matthew" had given these words of the prophet a new application, so the scribe affirms his conviction that their source was divine, not only because they were spoken through a prophet but also because they are part of the whole corpus of writings held sacred by the church.

II Timothy 3:16

This verse has long been used by conservative evangelicals in support of the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. We are not concerned here with the validity of such an argument but merely to state that there is an ambiguity in the Greek text itself which is reflected in the translation of this verse in the NEB as over against the RSV. The latter reads: "All scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness. . . ." The NEB reads: "Every inspired scripture has its use for teaching the truth and refuting error, or for reformation of manners and discipline in right living . . . ." The Greek from which these translations are derived is the same except that the NEB appears to follow a reading found in certain witnesses which omit "and" (καὶ) following the Greek word θεόπνευστος which is translated "inspired by God" in the RSV.[1]

The Greek text itself is ambiguous, but the omission of καὶ in certain early versions and fathers enabled some early interpreters of this passage to translate it very much as does the NEB. For example, the Syriac Peshitta may be translated: "All scripture which is inspired by God is useful. . . ."

The problem is perhaps mainly one of translation, but the omission of καὶ tends to support the rendering of the NEB. Other translations which support this rendering are those of Wyclif, Luther and Grotius, while the RSV has the support of the KJV, Moffatt, ASV, Goodspeed, and others.[2]

Although the translation of this verse in the NEB need not be understood to raise the question of plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, it has apparently caused some concern among conservative scholars lest this interpretation be given to the verse. R.J.A. Sheriffs in an article published in The Evangelical Quarterly seeks to make clear that the doctrine of plenary inspiration is not dependent on this single passage and, in any case, the reference in this verse is to the sacred Scriptures, which Timothy was exhorted to use for the good of those entrusted to his care.[3]

---

[1] The witnesses which omit καὶ include the Old Latin text of Codex Augiensis (f), the Clementine Vulgate, Syr. pesh., the Latin translation of Origen, and Ambrosiaster.

[2] See R.J.A. Sheriffs, "A Note on a Verse in the New English Bible," The Evangelical Quarterly, XXXIV (1962), 95.

[3] Ibid.

Luke 24:27

There are occasions in the text of the New Testament when a change in the order of words can alter the meaning of a passage or provide a slightly different interpretation. The text of Luke 24:27 is a case in point. It reads: "And beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." (RSV) Marchant A. King has called attention to the reading of this verse in P75, in which the words "in all the scriptures" (ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς) are placed at the end of the sentence "giving them considerably greater emphasis and suggesting how deeply impressed was this scribe or some earlier one by the fullness of the Old Testament testimony to Christ."[1] No one would seriously contend that the order of words in P75 (c. A.D. 200) represents the original text; however, the point is well taken that the reading of P75 in this verse suggests a more explicit emphasis on the testimony of "all the Scriptures" to Jesus Christ. Such an interpretation is in keeping with the increasingly important role of the Scriptures in the life and mission of the early church.

II Peter 1:20, 21

The correct interpretation of prophecy was a matter of great concern to the author of II Peter. For him the words of the prophets were to be found in the sacred writings or the Scriptures, and their interpretation was not a private matter. "First of all you must understand this, that no *prophecy of scripture* is a matter of one's own interpretation, because no prophecy ever came by the impulse of man, but men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God." (RSV, vss. 20, 21) The reading "prophecy of scripture" is that found in the majority of witnesses, both early and late. But this phrase must have seemed an inadequate description of the sacred writings, to the scribe of P72 or an earlier one, who wrote "prophecy and scripture." He was apparently of the opinion that the words of this passage apply not only to the prophetic word in the Old Testament, but to the whole body of sacred writings, which by his time must have included certain New Testament writings as well. Thus the scribe of P72 would extend the meaning of this verse to include all the Scriptures, certainly the entire Old Testament canon and perhaps also the writings which were already recognized as bearing testimony to a new revelation in Christ, with the aim of declaring that the whole of scripture has a fixed meaning which cannot be supplanted by an individual interpretation.[1]

---

[1] M. A. King, "Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript of Luke," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXII (1965), 239.

Of further interest in this passage is the reading found in many manuscripts, including S A, the Latin Vulgate, the Philoxinian Syriac, and the mass of Byzantine witnesses, which describes the prophets in verse 21 as "holy men of God." In other witnesses (C and 1739) they are described as "holy" men who spoke from God. In view of the excellent support for the reading which makes no reference to the prophets as "holy," it would seem that the above readings represent alterations in the text. The motive for such changes can readily be explained as a desire to recognize the unique role of the prophets as bearers of the divine revelation. Such a description of the prophets could well have been drawn from Old Testament references to holy persons or it could have been suggested by the reference to the "holy prophets" in II Peter

---

[1] Codex 614 (eleventh century) and others read "scripture of prophecy," but this is probably to be explained as an inconsequential transposition.

3:2 (cf. Eph. 3:5). Whatever the origin of this description as applied to prophets, its purpose is to exalt the role of the prophets and to enhance the importance of the "prophecy of scripture" as an authoritative message from God.

Romans 1:7, 15

Textual critics have long been aware of the omission of any reference to Rome in the text of these verses as recorded in Codex Boernerianus (G^P, ninth century). According to the apparatus in Nestle's text there is also some evidence that Origen at times omitted the words "in Rome" in his use of verse 7. These data, together with the textual and literary evidence affecting the last two chapters of the epistle, have led some scholars to speculate that at least two forms of the epistle existed in the early church. This is not the place to discuss the different hypotheses which have been constructed to explain the complex nature of the evidence affecting the original form of the epistle, but simply to state that the omission of the words "in Rome" in at least one important witness is related to this problem, which has not yet been cleared up.[1]

Aside from the complicated issue of the exact form of the original letter to the Romans, the evidence for the omission of the reference to Rome in verses 7 and 15 would seem to be too slight to regard this reading as representing the original text. Moreover, Paul's usage in certain other letters lends support to the argument for the commonly accepted reading in Romans 1:7, 15.[1] A better explanation of the textual data in these verses is that offered by C. K. Barrett in commenting on the variants found in Codex G^P: "It is probable that the variant (here and at i.15) reflects a desire to show that the epistle is of universal, and not merely local, application."[2]

---

[1] See the excellent treatment of these problems and the hypotheses offered for their solution in C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans ("Harper's New Testament Commentaries"; New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1957), pp. 9-13. Hereafter cited as Barrett, Epistle to the Romans. For the view that Paul prepared and dispatched at least two forms of the letter (to Rome and to Ephesus) see T. W. Manson, "St. Paul's Letter to the Romans--and Others," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXXI (1948), 224-240.

Codex G^P, which once formed part of the same codex with a manuscript of the Gospels, Codex Sangallensis, is thought to have been written by Irish monks in the monastery of St. Gall.[3] That the scribe, or scribes, who prepared this manuscript may have felt that this epistle was intended for the edification of the entire Church and not simply for "all those in Rome whom God loves" (Goodspeed) is certainly a plausible argument. Whereas Paul had written the letter with the church at Rome in mind and was unaware that this document would become a part of Holy Scripture to be widely read with approval throughout the church, the scribe(s) who prepared Codex G^P saw no reason to limit the message of this letter to the Christians of Rome. Thus, verse 7a in this manuscript reads: "To all those who are in the love of God, called to be saints."[4] This form of address near the beginning of Paul's letter gives it the widest possible application in keeping with its more universal appeal as a statement

---

1. See I Cor. 1:2, II Cor. 1:1, Phil. 1:1.

2. Barrett, Romans, p. 15, n. 1.   3. Metzger, Text, p. 53.

4. The words "in the love of God" are likewise found in the Old Latin d*, Codex Amiatinus of the Vulgate, Ambrosiaster and Pelagius. These witnesses represent good support for the reading in Codex G^P, but it must be remembered that they do not omit the words "in Rome."

of Paul's gospel. In adopting this form of the text in verses 7 and 15 the scribe(s) of Codex G^P conveys the conviction that this letter was intended for all believers and should be read and studied with this in mind.

Acts 8:31, 32, 35

An illustration of the important role of the Scriptures in the missionary task of the early church may be seen in the account of the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8:26-39. In this account Philip is reported to have found the eunuch reading from the prophet Isaiah. When asked if he understood what he was reading, the eunuch replied, "How can I, unless some one guides me?" (RSV, v. 31) The text of a recently discovered Coptic manuscript of Acts adds at this point: " . . . in these scriptures and teaches me what they are dealing of?"[1] In verse 32 the manuscript (designated G67) continues in place of the usual text: "He opened the book, he found the passage of this scripture which the eunuch was reading, 'He was led . . . .'"[2] Following the quotation from Isaiah and the eunuch's question as to its meaning, verse 35 (as translated by T. C. Peterson) continues the narrative: "Then Philip took his beginning from the scripture, and now he was in the spirit, he began to explain to him from the scripture, preached the Lord Jesus Christ to him."[3]

---

[1] Theodore C. Peterson, "An Early Coptic Manuscript of Acts: An Unrevised Version of the Ancient So-Called Western Text," *CBQ*, XXVI (1964), 225-241, esp. p. 236. Hereafter cited as Peterson, "An Early Coptic Manuscript of Acts." Peterson has shown that this manuscript has a distinctively "Western" character, being an earlier witness than Codex Bezae and offering further evidence of the "Western" type of text in Egypt as early as the fourth century, or perhaps earlier.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 236.

[3] *Ibid*. The usual text of verse 35 reads: "Then Philip opened his mouth, and beginning with this scripture he told him the good news of Jesus."

of Paul's gospel. In adopting this form of the text in verses 7 and 15 the scribe(s) of Codex G^p conveys the conviction that this letter was intended for all believers and should be read and studied with this in mind.

Acts 8:31, 32, 35

An illustration of the important role of the Scriptures in the missionary task of the early church may be seen in the account of the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8:26-39. In this account Philip is reported to have found the eunuch reading from the prophet Isaiah. When asked if he understood what he was reading, the eunuch replied, "How can I, unless some one guides me?" (RSV, v. 31) The text of a recently discovered Coptic manuscript of Acts adds at this point: " . . . in these scriptures and teaches me what they are dealing of?"[1] In verse 32 the manuscript (designated G67) continues in place of the usual text: "He opened the book, he found the passage of this scripture which the eunuch was reading, 'He was led . . . .'"[2] Following the quotation from Isaiah and the eunuch's question as to its meaning, verse 35 (as translated by T. C. Peterson) continues the narrative: "Then Philip took his beginning from the scripture, and now he was in the spirit, he began to explain to him from the scripture, preached the Lord Jesus Christ to him."[3]

---

[1] Theodore C. Peterson, "An Early Coptic Manuscript of Acts: An Unrevised Version of the Ancient So-Called Western Text," CBQ, XXVI (1964), 225-241, esp. p. 236. Hereafter cited as Peterson, "An Early Coptic Manuscript of Acts." Peterson has shown that this manuscript has a distinctively "Western" character, being an earlier witness than Codex Bezae and offering further evidence of the "Western" type of text in Egypt as early as the fourth century, or perhaps earlier.

[2] Ibid., p. 236.

[3] Ibid. The usual text of verse 35 reads: "Then Philip opened his mouth, and beginning with this scripture he told him the good news of Jesus."

The above readings from the recently discovered Coptic manuscript represent unique variations in these verses of the text of Acts, yet they resemble the character of many other Western readings in Acts in that they provide some additional detail. But there is a decided interest in these readings which is reflected in the attention given to the role of the Scriptures in Philip's encounter with the eunuch. This is particularly noticeable in the addition to the eunuch's question in verse 31 and in Philip's action described in verse 35. In both instances the place of scripture in explicating the Christian message is given considerable emphasis. Furthermore, the description of Philip's action in verse 35 is suggestive of the manner in which early Christian evangelists must have undertaken the task of preaching and teaching. The fact that he was "in the spirit" when he began to expound the word of scripture suggests that interpreting the scripture was still recognized as a charismatic function in the area where this manuscript originated.

Chapter III

VARIANTS WHICH BEAR UPON THE PERSON OF CHRIST

The previous chapter dealt with certain variant readings in the New Testament which bear the stamp of doctrinal interests that developed out of the early Christians' attempt to understand the nature of God and of the divine revelation to which the Scriptures bear testimony. Now we shall turn our attention to selected passages containing textual variations which relate to the doctrine of Christ. The fact that such variations are more numerous can be explained by the fact that the early church was more preoccupied with Christological questions than with other doctrinal concerns. Because of the large number and variety of these variations we shall consider them under several headings.

The Virginal Conception and the Birth of Jesus

Matthew 1:16

The familiar reading of this verse in Matthew's genealogy is as follows: "And Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ." (ERV, ASV) This reading is supported by Pl S B, the Latin Vulgate, Syr. pesh., the Coptic versions, Tertullian, and the mass of late Greek manuscripts. It is preferred by almost all modern translators of the English Bible. But there are two alternative readings, one of which is found in the Koridethi manuscript, fam. 13, some Old Latin manuscripts, and Syr. cur., and may be translated, "Jacob begot Joseph, to whom the virgin Mary was betrothed who bore Jesus who is called Christ." The other reading is that found in the Sinaitic Syriac manuscript: "Jacob begot Joseph. Joseph, to whom was betrothed the virgin Mary, begot Jesus who is called Christ." The discovery of the latter reading in an Old Syriac palimpsest caused a sensation among New Testament scholars and led some to favor it as the reading from which the other two were derived. F. C. Conybeare, as early as 1902, called attention to a quotation of this passage in Matthew from an old anti-Jewish "Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila," published at Oxford in 1898, and an Arabic version of Tatian's Diatessaron as evidence of a form of the text from which both readings in the Greek manuscripts were derived.[1] The fact that these sources seemed to lend support to the reading of the Sinaitic Syriac prompted many scholars, including F. C. Burkitt and Sir Frederic Kenyon, to declare that the context would not permit such a reading in that the following verses in Matthew proceed to relate the story of Jesus' birth of a virgin (vss. 18 ff.). This argument was later challenged on the ground that "when Matthew 1:1-16 is viewed as a separate pericope the force of the striking reading is by no means cancelled, for it is of the essence of form- and social-history that each section bears its own witness."[2] This reference to form-critical analysis may help to explain how the form of the text represented by the Sinaitic Syriac could have arisen but it also suggests the difficulty of recovering the "original" text of Matthew in this verse.

---

[1] Conybeare, "Modifications," pp. 96-102. According to Conybeare, the text of the "Dialogue" reads: "Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, out of whom was begotten Jesus who is called Christ, and Joseph begat Jesus who is called Christ. . . ." (Ibid., p. 100) Conybeare's argument has not been widely accepted by scholars. Von Soden's first apparatus lists nine variant forms of the text in Matt. 1:16 which he regarded as of approximately equal validity. Three of these are apparently taken from the text of the "Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila." See Nestle's apparatus (25th ed.) at Matt. 1:16.

[2] Riddle, "Textual Criticism," p. 224. Sherman E. Johnson has suggested that Matthew's source possibly contained some such reading as is found in the

Vincent Taylor in a lengthy discussion of various alternative solutions to the textual problem in Matthew 1:16 reached the conclusion that none of the three readings given above represents the original text, but that the text can be reconstructed from a comparison of these readings.[1] Translated, his reconstructed text would read: "And Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary. And Joseph begat Jesus who is called Christ." Taylor recognized the lack of textual support for this conjecture, "apart from the fact that each phrase in it is attested in the textual tradition."[2] But this was not considered by him to be an insuperable objection "in view of the freedom with which the text of the Gospels was handled during the first half of the second century, and which the textual variants illustrate."[3] Taylor therefore concluded that the first two readings cited above (the first one being attested in most extant uncials and minuscules, the second being attested mainly in Caesarean and Western witnesses) "are independent attempts to alter the original text in the interests of the Virgin Birth; that is, they are 'doctrinal modifications.'"[4] He further

---

Sinaitic Syriac. "If that source continued to be extant for some time, the reading may have crept into some MSS of Matthew." See "The Gospel According to St. Matthew: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, edited by G. A. Buttrick, *et al.* (12 vols.; New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951), VII, 253. Hereafter cited as Johnson, "St. Matthew."

[1] See Vincent Taylor, *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth* (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1920), pp. 104-114. Hereafter cited as Taylor, *Historical Evidence*.

[2] Vincent Taylor, *The Text of the New Testament* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1961), pp. 78 f. Hereafter cited as Taylor, *Text*.

[3] Taylor, *Historical Evidence*, p. 113.

[4] *Ibid.*

concluded: "The reading of the Sinaitic Syriac is not unfavorable to the doctrine. It should no longer be spoken of as 'the eccentric reading; nor should we describe the translator as influenced by 'heretical tendencies.'"[1] He holds that in the first reading the passive (ἐγεννήθη) has been substituted for the active (ἐγέννησεν) which the Evangelist had used throughout the genealogy, employing the word in a legal rather than a physical sense. The change to the passive in the last link of the chain, he argues, makes the verb refer to physical parentage, thus reversing the meaning intended by the Evangelist. Again he observes that the second reading "omits τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας and sharpens the allusion to the Virgin Birth by means of the phrase μνηστευθεῖσα παρθένος Μαριάμ leaving the subject of ἐγέννησεν uncertain or at least ambiguous."[2]

As we have noted, the first reading is preferred by most editors and commentators. If it was the original reading, then the second and third forms of the text could be explained in part as modifications which arose because the phrase "the husband of Mary" gave offense to later scribes.[3]

C.S.C. Williams rejects the Sinaitic Syriac reading as "probably due to a scribe repeating Joseph's name twice; dittography was easy in 1, 16 after each name of the genealogy had been repeated twice."[4] He argues that the choice lies between the first and second readings and seems to favor the first or best attested reading.

The difficulties of arriving at a decision concerning the original text of Matthew 1:16 are obvious. Indeed, we need not wait until such a decision is reached in order to point out that doctrinal considerations are involved in the choice of readings. It is to be hoped that our discussion of the textual problems in this verse will have made this fact clear.[1]

---

[1] Taylor, Historical Evidence, pp. 113 f.

[2] Taylor, Text, p. 78.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Williams, Alterations, p. 25.

Matthew 1:21, 25

It is interesting to note that in Matthew 1:21 the Old Syriac Sinaiticus and Curetonian manuscripts contain an addition to the text which might possibly bear upon the doctrine of virginal conception. The angel announces to Joseph that "she [Mary] will bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus. . . ." (RSV) But the Old Syriac manuscripts read: "[S]he will bear to you a son, and you shall call his name Jesus. . . ." This variant is peculiar to the Old Syriac and might well be understood as an attempt to emphasize the paternity of Joseph in the midst of the tradition concerning the Virgin Birth. This particular interest may also be seen in the Sinaitic Syriac reading of Matthew 1:16.

Still another reading which is peculiar to Syriac Sinaiticus and one Old Latin manuscript (k) is the omission of "he knew her not until" (οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν ἕως οὗ) in Matthew 1:25, where other witnesses include these words: "but knew her not until she had born a son; and he called his name Jesus." (RSV) In this same verse Syriac Sinaiticus reads "to him" before "son," thus bringing Joseph once again into focus in connection with the birth of Jesus. These variations in the Old Syriac need not be interpreted as denying the virginal conception, for the scribe of Syriac Sinaiticus makes no attempt to alter the pronouncements concerning the role of the Holy Spirit in Mary's conception. The addition of "to you" in verse 21 and "to him" in verse 25 of the Old Syriac may represent a mere stylistic addition to the Syriac by the translator of the Old Syriac Gospel, which never had a place in the Greek text.[1]

---

[1] W. F. Howard, after citing the second and third readings given above, has this comment: "The most that can be said of these alternatives is that they seem to point to some stage in the text when the doctrine (of the virgin birth) was not unambiguously expressed in this verse." See Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine," p. 13.

On the other hand, F. C. Burkitt held that the agreement between the Old Latin (k) and the original form of the Old Syriac (Syr. sin.) in omitting the words "knew her not until" in verse 25 "carries us back to the earliest stage of the Canonical text."[2] According to this view, the words "knew her not until" would constitute a gloss introduced at this point in deference to later Christians who might misunderstand the shorter text because of their greater concern with the significance of the physical miracle than with the legality of our Lord's title to be Heir of David.[3] Burkitt also notes that the Diatessaron and Syriac Curetonian insert at this point the words "lived purely with her until," and that the scribe of Syriac Curetonian changes "his wife" into "Mary." He saw these changes as further attempts to remove the impression that Joseph and Mary might have lived together as man and wife.[4]

Burkitt's argument in support of the shorter text in Matthew 1:25 draws attention to the theological implications in the longer reading if the latter is understood as a secondary addition to the original text; but if the longer text is original, then it is difficult to explain the omission of the words "knew her not until" in Syr. sin. and the Old Latin (k).

---

[1] So F. C. Burkitt, Evangelion da-Mepharreshe (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1904), II, 262. Hereafter cited as Burkitt, Evangelion da-Mepharreshe.

[2] Ibid., p. 261. [3] Ibid.

[4] C.S.C. Williams thinks it is more likely that Tatianic influence is to be seen in the Old Latin and Old Syriac readings in this verse. He concludes: "There is no inherent improbability in the view that Tatian's variant 'he lived purely with her until' in Mt. 1, 25 influenced Syr.$^{c.}$ and caused a lacuna found in k and Syr.$^{s.}$ For Tatian's Diatessaron may have been written later than the Old Syriac Gospel and yet before Syr.$^{s.}$ and Syr.$^{c.}$ appeared." (Williams, Alterations, p. 28.)

Mark 6:3

The familiar reading of this passage begins, "Is not this the carpenter the son of Mary . . . ?" It has the support of a wide spectrum of early witnesses, being attested in all branches of the textual tradition including the Alexandrian (S B 892 the Cop. sah. and boh.), the Caesarean (Koridethi fam. 1 28 1071 and some Georgian manuscripts), the Western (D, f ff l q, and some Latin Vulgate manuscripts) and in the later Byzantine text. Apparently it was not known to Origen or else he overlooked it when he wrote: "Nowhere in the Gospels circulated in the Churches is Jesus Himself described as a carpenter." (Contra Celsum, vi. 36)[1] The suggestion by Hort in his "Notes on Select Readings" that Origen either forgot this passage or did not hold Mark responsible for the words of the Galileans is hardly satisfactory.[2] There was another reading with which Origen was familiar: "Is not this the son of the carpenter and of Mary . . . ?" It is attested in some Caesarean manuscripts (P45, fam. 13 565 700), in a few Alexandrian witnesses (33 579 and Coptic boh.), in Old Latin manuscripts of European origin (a b c i r^2), in one African Latin codex (e) and the Vulgate.

It would be difficult to reach a decision as to which of these readings represents the original text on the basis of external evidence, though the balance would seem to favor the more familiar reading, "the carpenter, the son of Mary." We shall point out some additional factors which should enter into such a decision.

---

[1] Cited by Williams, Alterations, p. 30.

[2] See Hort, Introduction, Appendix, p. 24.

It has been urged by some critics that the first reading above raises difficulties because of its use of the phrase "the son of Mary." In Jewish circles this would be recognized as a slur on Mary, inasmuch as a child would be known as the son of his father unless he were illegitimate.[1] At the same time this phrase might be understood as a reference to the virgin birth tradition which is not otherwise present in Mark. Thus the first reading could be explained as an attempt to avoid the suggestion that Jesus was literally the son of Joseph, which is assumed in the second reading, and to affirm the tradition that he was born of the Virgin Mary.

On the other hand, the second reading above may be the result of assimilation to the parallel passage in Matthew 13:55, which refers to Jesus as "the carpenter's son." Some scribes may have preferred this reading because it avoided the suggestion that Jesus ever engaged in a menial occupation.

The present writer is inclined to agree with the judgment of Frederick C. Grant that the reading "the carpenter, the son of Mary" is probably due to a revision of the text under the influence of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth.[2] If the original text of Mark had read "the carpenter, the son of Mary," Grant thinks it is most improbable that both Matthew and Luke would have changed it to their present readings in similar contexts. (See Matthew 13:55 and Luke 4:22.)[3] Vincent Taylor is in agreement with this view when he says of

---

[1] Williams, Alterations, p. 30; cf. Judges 11:1 f.

[2] F. C. Grant, "The Gospel According to St. Mark: Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick, et al.;(12 vols.; New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951), VII, 727.

[3] Ibid. This argument assumes the priority of Mark, and that Luke, in

Matthew, "'Son of Mary' would have been a phrase congenial to his mind, and it is not easy to think that he would have used instead the words 'the son of the carpenter' unless they already stood in Mk."[1]

If this argument is sustained, then the conclusion must be that the reading "the carpenter, the son of Mary" implies a different theological interpretation from the alternative reading cited above, with particular reference to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth.

Luke 2:5

In Luke 2:4 f. it is reported that Joseph, who was of the house and lineage of David, went up to Bethlehem "to be enrolled with Mary, his betrothed, who was with child." (RSV) The words "his betrothed" translate a reading in the Greek text which is widely attested in the earliest extant witnesses to the text (ἐμνηστευμένῃ αυτῷ).[2] A second reading is found in Syriac Sinaiticus and the Old Latin codices b and c, which is translated "his wife." A third reading, which can best be explained as a conflation of the other two, is attested in Koridethi, fam. 13, a few Old Latin manuscripts, and the Vulgate. It is the familiar form of the text found in the Textus Receptus, which reads, " . . . with Mary his espoused wife." There are few who would argue that the latter represents the original reading in this passage, so that the decision lies between the first two.

---

writing his account of the Nazareth pericope, was in some measure dependent upon Mark's account.

[1] Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1952), p. 300. Hereafter cited as Taylor, St. Mark.

[2] These include S B C D L W 1 565 700, a e f r, Syr. pesh., Copt. sah. and boh.

C.S.C. Williams thinks that the first reading is probably the original in view of its excellent attestation in Alexandrian, Caesarean and Western manuscripts.[1] He would explain the second reading as having arisen because someone imagined that it was more proper for Joseph to have had Mary as his wife on a journey than as his espoused. Once the addition of γυναικὶ was made in the text, the third reading "espoused wife" would follow easily enough.[2]

Other scholars, notably J. M. Creed and B. S. Easton, prefer the second reading, in which Mary is spoken of simply as Joseph's wife.[3] Creed suggests that the reading found in S B D and other witnesses is an early modification under the influence of Luke 1:27. This is likewise the view of Vincent Taylor, who asserts that this modification was made in the interest of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth.[4] The importance of this doctrine to a great many early Christians is evident in the writings of the fathers, so that alterations in the text of the New Testament might well be expected to lend support to a view which was widely accepted as the prevailing understanding of Jesus' birth.

---

[1] Williams, *Alterations*, p. 29.

[2] *Ibid*. This explanation might be countered by the suggestion that Luke himself *could* have written "his wife" because it would be strange if Mary were to travel with Joseph when she was only betrothed to him. (See J. M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1930), p. 33. Hereafter cited as Creed, *St. Luke*.

[3] Creed, St. Luke, p. 33. See also Burton Scott Easton, *The Gospel According to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. (*New York*: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926), p. 22, who regards the reading "who was betrothed to him" as impossible on the grounds that according to both Jewish and Greek custom when Joseph removed Mary from the care of her parents, she would be regarded as his wife. Hereafter cited as Easton, *St. Luke*.

[4] Taylor, *Text*, p. 91.

Luke 2:22

"And when the time came for their purification according to the law of Moses, they brought him up to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord." (RSV) It is almost certain that the original text of this passage read "their purification" in view of the fact that this reading is attested in almost all ancient witnesses. The difficulty of such a reading might also prompt some scribes to "correct" it so as to ease the difficulty. A significant variation is found at this point in certain witnesses, including Codex Bezae 21 209, Syr. sin., Copt. sah., and the Armenian version, which reads "his purification" in place of "their purification." This reading can best be explained as an intentional alteration made in order to indicate a belief in the virgin-conception.[1]

Another variation is attested in at least one manuscript (76) which alters the text in this verse to read "her purification," probably under the influence of Leviticus 12:4-6, a passage which prescribes the ritual requirement for purification of a woman who has given birth to a child. Other witnesses ease the difficulty in this passage by omitting any genitive pronoun. The omission of a pronoun referring to Mary could be understood as supporting the doctrine of the Virginal Conception of Jesus.

Luke 2:41, 43

Twice in the narrative concerning the visit to Jerusalem when Jesus was twelve years old Luke refers to Joseph and Mary as "his parents" with no apparent desire to convey a particular theological view regarding Jesus' birth (see vss. 41 and 43). But in some manuscripts the words have been altered in order to safeguard the doctrine of the Virgin Birth of Jesus. In verse 41 the words "his parents" have been changed to read "Joseph and Mary" in some Old Latin manuscripts (a b l r) or "Joseph and Mary his mother" in others (c ff^2). At the end of verse 43 the same words have been altered to read "Joseph and his mother" in the Old Latin (b f ff^2 l q r), Codex Ephraemi (C), 69 and 372.

---

[1] Williams, Alterations, p. 29.

Similarly, in Luke 2:27 the text reads: " . . . and when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him according to the custom of the law . . . ." (RSV) But in one manuscript (245) the words "the parents" are omitted, possibly in the interest of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth.

Luke 2:33, 48

Again, the best-attested reading in Luke 2:33 refers to Jesus' parents as "his father and mother."[1] But Koridethi and other Greek manuscripts, the Old Latin, and the Byzantine text support another reading in which "Joseph" replaces "his father." The emended text reads: "And Joseph and the mother marveled . . . ."

At the end of verse 48 most witnesses read: "Behold, your father and I have been looking for you anxiously." (RSV) The Syriac Curetonian manuscript, however, reads: "Behold, we have been looking for you anxiously." Some old Latin witnesses (a b ff^2 l) simply omit the subject of the verb. Such alterations were doubtless made in order to safeguard the commonly accepted doctrine of the Virgin Birth. While the best-attested reading in each case cited above need not be understood as undermining the belief in that doctrine, some early Christians evidently felt that the text of the New Testament must be made to bear clear testimony in support of the doctrine in those passages which refer to Joseph as the father of Jesus.

---

[1] The following witnesses support this reading: S B D L 1 131 157, g^2, the Latin Vulgate, Copt. sah. and others.

Luke 2:4, 5

While some textual variations indicate a desire on the part of scribes to uphold the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, there is some evidence which points to a desire to maintain still another Christological view, viz., that Jesus is the son of David. The genealogies in Matthew and Luke show an interest in the Davidic descent of Jesus as Messiah. Luke also says that Joseph went up to Bethlehem at the time of the enrollment, "because he was of the house and lineage of David." (2:4) Yet the doctrine of the Virginal Conception might be interpreted as denying that Jesus is the son of David if David's line is through Joseph. The problem is suggested by Luke's statement that "he (Joseph) was of the house and lineage of David." Consequently, a few witnesses read "they" (αὐτούς) in place of "he" (αὐτόν) in this clause.[1] The Sinaitic Syriac gives the following reading at the end of verse 4: " . . . because both (of them) were of the house and lineage of David." Moreover, in this manuscript this clause is placed after verse 5, an order of words which finds support in Codex Bezae also.

This alteration of the text in Syriac Sinaiticus might be understood as an attempt to explain why both Joseph and Mary went up to Bethlehem to be enrolled, but in fact that question is best answered in the narrative of Jesus' birth at Bethlehem which follows. The textual modification in verse 4 is probably best explained as an attempt to preserve the son of David Christology alongside the doctrine of the Virgin Birth.

---

[1] These include the Old Latin (e) and two Greek minuscules (34 1216).

John 1:13

In the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel the Evangelist describes the action of the Logos in coming into the world. But the world did not know him; nor did the people to whom he came receive him. The Evangelist then declares that to those who received him he gave the "right" to become children of God, "who were born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God." (vs. 13, RSV) This is the reading in almost all witnesses to the text of this verse. The passage is not directly concerned with the doctrine of the Virgin Birth; nor does the Fourth Evangelist refer to it elsewhere. But there are a few witnesses which have the singular form of the verb--*non* (*qui non* b Irenaeus$^{\text{lat.}}$) . . . *natus est* (b Justin [?], Irenaeus, Tertullian). These are all Western authorities and their combined testimony is strong, but not strong enough to overthrow the plural reading which is demanded by the reference to "those who believed" in verse 12 and by the sense of the passage.[1]

On the other hand some critics (including Harnack, Loisy, Zahn, and Blass) have argued for the priority of the reading which gives the singular by appealing to its early attestation and by connecting verse 13 with verse 14. But this does not explain how the plural came to be substituted for the singular. Of course, Tertullian accused the Valentinians of changing the text at this point (*De Carne Christi* XX and XXIV); however, the charge of corrupting the text of the Scriptures was leveled against all heretics.[2] Although the patristic evidence which supports this reading is as early as the second and third centuries (in the case of Irenaeus and Tertullian), we now have the testimony of the Bodmer Papyri ($P^{66.75}$) which are from the same period and which support the reading found in all the Greek manuscripts--"who were born."

---

[1] Barrett, *St. John*, p. 137. It should be noted also that Syr. cur. has the plural pronoun and the singular verb (οἳ . . . ἐγεννήθη).

[2] Williams, *Alterations*, p. 31.

It appears likely that some early scribe emended the text at this point in order to provide an explicit reference to the Virgin Birth in the Gospel of John. This passage, with its threefold negation concerning the regeneration of Christians, could by a slight emendation be made to refer to the Virgin Birth of Jesus.[1]

Christological Variants of a Doctrinal or Reverential Nature

Luke 11:42

The ordinary text of this verse reads: "But woe to you Pharisees! for you tithe mint and rue and every herb, and neglect justice and the love of God; these you ought to have done, without neglecting the others." (RSV) The implication of the last clause in this passage is that Jesus upheld the teaching of the Mosaic law, including the requirement of the tithe. Thus the law might be understood as binding upon Christians since Jesus had apparently cited certain commandments with approval.

---

[1] See Barrett, St. John, pp. 137 f., who rejects the reading which refers explicitly to the birth of Jesus but who thinks it probable "that John was alluding to Jesus' birth (in this passage) and declaring that the birth of Christians, being bloodless and rooted in God's will alone, followed the pattern of the birth of Christ himself." Cf. also the treatment of this verse in A. T. Robertson, Studies in the Text of the New Testament (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1926), pp. 174-185, who thought it "quite possible that John has the Virgin Birth of Jesus in mind and makes a veiled reference to it." (P. 180)

But the last clause in this verse (ταῦτα . . . παρεῖναι) is omitted in certain Western witnesses, including Codex Bezae, the Old Latin (d b) and Marcion. Because of his rejection of the Jewish scriptures with their many legal requirements, Marcion would have found these words at the end of verse 42 quite unacceptable. E. C. Blackman agrees with the judgment of Harnack that this is a case of deliberate Marcionite omission: "Jesus could not be allowed to concede even a subordinate place to the ethical law."[1] The influence of Marcion may account for the omission of these words in D, d and b. Blackman includes this verse in his list of tendentious alterations by Marcion which crept into the Old Latin tradition at certain points.[2] Thus Marcion's view concerning the origin and nature of Christ, together with his rejection of all things Jewish would in his mind justify the exclusion of this statement from Jesus' teaching. His action apparently had some influence upon manuscripts which were used by Christians outside his own circle of followers.

Luke 16:12

In the context to which this verse belongs Jesus is reported to be addressing his disciples on the subject of faithful use of whatever is entrusted to them, especially "the true riches" or the genuine treasure of heaven (vs. 11). Thus in verse 12 he asks, "And if you have not been faithful in that which is another's, who will give you that which is your own?" (RSV) "That which is your own" is the best-attested reading (P75 S D Koridethi, some Old Latin manuscripts, the Old Syriac, and the Byzantine text), but Codex

---

1. See the comment on this verse in Blackman, Marcion, p. 139.

2. Ibid., pp. 156 f. Blackman has also noted that the more obvious Marcionite emendation in the previous line " . . . and neglect the calling and the love of God" has left no effects on non-Marcionite texts. (Ibid., p. 40.)

Vaticanus and Origen read "that which is our own." The latter was adopted by Westcott-Hort and Nestle while Tischendorf and most modern translators have adopted the better-attested reading, which is translated in the RSV and the NEB.

However, the most significant variant from the standpoint of this investigation is that attested by Marcion and three Old Latin witnesses (e i l) which reads: " . . . who will give you what is mine?" (*quod meum est*). E. C. Blackman thinks that the reading found in e i l (also 157) may be attributed to the influence of Marcion's text on the Old Latin tradition.[1] Marcion and others evidently felt that "the true riches" mentioned in verse 11 belonged to Christ, who is addressing his disciples in this passage. He is the one who brings the gift of the true riches to his followers. Marcion would likely have seen what Christ gives as over against what belongs to another, viz., the Creator. The gift of the true riches could not be described, for Marcion at least, as "that which is your own"; nor could it be spoken of as "that which is our own," for this would imply that Jesus places himself in the same category with other heirs of that gift. Therefore, neither of these readings would have been satisfactory to Marcion and hence the alteration of the text at this point.

Luke 21:32

As it stands this verse, when coupled with the one which follows it, raises a serious problem for the interpreter. Jesus is reported as saying, "Truly, I say to you, this generation will not pass away till all has taken place." (RSV) Such a statement must have troubled many early Christians, just as it disturbs the minds of some believers today. It is not clear how Luke intends it to be interpreted. Perhaps he is thinking of the fall of Jerusalem.[1]

---

[1] See Blackman, *Marcion*, p. 157.

According to Tertullian, Marcion emended the text of this verse to read: "[H]eaven and earth will not pass away until all things have come to pass" (peragantur).[2] One Old Latin codex (e) from the fifth century reads: "Heaven itself will not pass away until all things are fulfilled." Blackman thinks that the reading in Codex e reflects the influence of Marcion's tendentious alteration of this verse.[3] Both Marcion and the scribe of Codex e seem to be offering a solution to the problem raised by the ordinary text of this verse by omitting any reference to "this generation" and substituting "heaven and earth" from verse 33 or "heaven itself," an expression with a Marcionite ring. Apparently, Marcion and others felt that Jesus could not have uttered the saying as it is found in the ordinary text, which might leave the impression that Jesus' words could not be trusted. (Cf. vs. 33.) Therefore, Marcion emended the text in order to avoid the difficulty suggested by the familiar reading.

Mark 1:41; John 11:33

When Jesus was approached on one occasion by a leper who appealed to him for healing, according to most witnesses, Mark describes Jesus' response as follows: "And being moved with pity, he stretched out his hand and touched him, and said to him, 'I will: be clean.'" (RSV) But certain Western authorities tell us that he was "moved with anger." It is this reading which is translated in the NEB: "In warm indignation Jesus stretched out his hand . . . ." R.V.G. Tasker explains the reason for this choice: "It appeared more probable that ὀργισθείς, found in D a d ff^2 r would have been changed to σπλαγχνισθείς, than that the alteration should have been in the other direction."[1]

---

[1] See Creed, St. Luke, p. 258, who cites Klostermann as holding this view. On the other hand, B. S. Easton thinks the "all" in verse 32 includes the reference to the coming of the Son of man in verse 27 quite as much as the fall of Jerusalem in verse 20. (Easton, St. Luke, p. 314.)

[2] See Harnack, Marcion, p. 232*, whose comment is: "Dieser Vers ist eine Schöpfung Marcions."

[3] Blackman, Marcion, pp. 156 f.

One witness, it should be noted, omits any reference to Jesus' emotion (Codex b). The NEB translators recorded this reading in a footnote because, says Tasker, "it is conceivable that both the references to the emotions of Jesus were additions to the text."[2]

More important is the adoption of the second reading in the text of the NEB. Other scholars have agreed with this judgment. C.S.C. Williams finds that this was the reading followed by Tatian and he concludes that in view of Tatian's support it was probably the original reading.[3] It would seem to be true that this is the more difficult reading, especially since as Williams argues:

> Matthew and Luke who follow Mark at this point give no participle at all: why should the note of pity be omitted by Matthew and especially by Luke who was fond of mentioning such traits in Jesus' character? It can be understood why each should wish to omit a note of anger.[4]

---

[1] Tasker, The Greek New Testament, p. 414. This explanation has been widely accepted. See Taylor, Text, p. 83; idem, St. Mark, p. 187.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Williams, Alterations, p. 24.

[4] Ibid.

Regardless of which reading is adopted as the original in this passage, it is obvious that some consideration must be given to the question of what early Christians thought was possible or proper to attribute to Jesus, even an expression of emotion on his part.

A similar instance of scribal modification is found in John 11:33, which describes Jesus' reaction when he saw Mary and the Jews with her weeping over the death of Lazarus. The end of that verse reads: " . . . he was deeply moved in spirit and troubled." (RSV) The Greek word which is translated "deeply moved" (ἐνεβριμήσατο) was used elsewhere as an expression of anger and displeasure.[1] Therefore, it could be translated "moved with indignation." Perhaps it is for this reason that we find certain witnesses (P66^{c} P45 D, a few other manuscripts, and Copt. sah.) which attest a variant reading: " . . . he was troubled in spirit like one who is indignant" (ὡς ἐμβριμούμενος). The subtle change may be borrowed from a similar expression in John 13:21, but it appears to have been made from reverential motives and in the interest of a proper understanding of Jesus.[2]

John 2:15

Another passage which has been slightly altered because of what the ordinary text suggests concerning the person of Christ is found in the Fourth Evangelist's account of the Cleansing of the Temple. "And making a whip of cords, he drove them all, with the sheep and oxen, out of the temple . . . ."

---

1. See Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Translated and Adapted by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 254. Hereafter cited as Bauer, Lexicon.

2. Porter, "Textual Analysis," p. 204.

(RSV) This statement in its present form would likely offend some sensitive readers of the Gospel of John. Even the great Biblical scholar Origen quoted it with an additional word (ὡς) placed before the term φραγέλλιον so as to read "something like a whip."[1] This slight alteration in the text appears also in several important witnesses--L W 33 565, Old Latin codices, the Latin Vulgate, the margin of the Harklean Syriac, and, more recently, in P66 and P75. Despite its attestation in witnesses as early as the first half of the third century, and in diverse locations, this variant is probably best explained as a tendentious alteration of the text in order to soften the picture of physical violence described in this verse. Origen and perhaps others may have viewed this episode as not entirely suited to the character of Jesus as they conceived of him.

Matthew 27:16-17

A few important witnesses to the text of Matthew 27:16-17 give the full name of Barabbas as "Jesus Barabbas." These include the Koridethi Manuscript, fam. 1, Syr. sin., Syr. pal., and the Georgian version. Origen attests this reading in verse 17 in his commentary on Matthew, but he himself disliked the reading and regarded it as a heretical interpolation.[2] He knew that it was not admitted by everyone, but since it was well known in his church he felt obligated to explain it as best he could.[3]

---

[1] Kenneth W. Clark, "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament," *JBL*, LXXXV (1966), 6.

[2] Taylor, *Text*, p. 81; cf. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 95, 101.

[3] See Vaganay, *Introduction*, p. 194, who gives a full discussion of this variant, pp. 193-197. He regards as unsatisfactory Hort's ingenious suggestion that the reading "Jesus Barabbas" arose from dittography because in verse 17 the abbreviation for Ἰ[ησοῦ]ν repeats the preceding letters of ὑμῖν . But Hort's argument would not explain the presence of this variant in verse 16. Cf. Hort, *Introduction*, Appendix, pp. 19 f.

F. C. Burkitt favored the reading of the Syr. sin., fam. 1 and others and argued that it should be adopted as the original text of Matthew 27:16-17 "on the ground of transcriptional probability, textual authority and internal appropriateness."[1] More recently other scholars, including C.S.C. Williams and Sherman E. Johnson, have indicated their preference for the longer reading because the omission of "Jesus" before "Barabbas" could have arisen from doctrinal or reverential motives.[2] The translators of the NEB were certain enough that "Jesus Barabbas" is the correct reading to adopt it in their text, thus reversing the judgment of most translators and editors of the Greek text. Among the reasons for this choice given by R.V.G. Tasker is that "Jesus" may well have been omitted from reverential motives.[3]

We are not suggesting that such a reading as "Jesus Barabbas" would greatly affect our theological understanding of the person of Christ, but that such a reading was offensive to some Christians who knew of its existence. Origen, according to Rufinus, noted that the name "Jesus Barabbas" was not found in many manuscripts and that omission of "Jesus" was perhaps correct; in any case the name Jesus would not go with any sinner.[4]

---

1. See Burkitt's discussion of this passage in his Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, pp. 277 f.

2. Williams, Alterations, p. 32; cf. Sherman E. Johnson, "St. Matthew," p. 594, who says, "The tendency would be to drop the name Jesus out of reverence for the Messiah."

3. Tasker, The Greek New Testament, p. 413.

4. Williams, Alterations, p. 32. Williams adds the suggestion that Origen's dislike of the reading "Jesus" before "Barabbas" may have led to its omission in the remaining Caesarean MSS, such as fam. 13. Cf. Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 136, who says that the weight of Origen's name would lead to its wholesale excision in other texts.

Luke 23:32

Another passage which has been altered out of reverential motives mentions Jesus in connection with the two criminals who were crucified with him. "Two others also, who were criminals, were led away to be put to death with him." (RSV) This English form would hardly offend anyone, but the Greek text could be interpreted otherwise if read without commas (Ἤγοντο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι κακοῦργοι δύο σὺν αὐτῷ ἀναιρεθῆναι--the reading in P75, S, and B), leaving the implication that Jesus also was a criminal. To avoid this possible implication most Greek witnesses have made a slight change in the word order to . . . ἕτεροι δύο κακοῦργοι . . . , thus subordinating the word κακοῦργοι ("and also two others, criminals, were led away with him to be crucified").[1] But the problem was solved in another way in certain witnesses to the earliest versions. Two Old Latin manuscripts (c and e), the Sinaitic Syriac, and the Coptic Sahidic simply omit to translate the word ἕτεροι .[2] Such tendentious handling of the text is readily understandable in a passage which mentions Jesus along with "other criminals."

John 19:5

The last half of John 19:5 is omitted in some witnesses, including P66, a few Old Latin manuscripts (a e ff^{2*} r) and one Coptic manuscript (Q). The ordinary text reads: " . . . and he (Pilate) said to them, 'Behold the man!'" Codex B omits the article in the last phrase, thus reading: "Behold a man!" There is some uncertainty as to what this statement attributed to Pilate meant to the author of the Fourth Gospel. He may have intended Pilate's reference to

---

[1] Metzger, Text, p. 202.

[2] Ibid.

Jesus as "the man" to be seen in contrast to the belief of others that he was Lord and God. This interpretation is supported by the text of Codex B. Or, the Evangelist may have meant this announcement on the lips of Pilate to be a reference to Jesus as the heavenly Man or the "Son of man," a phrase which John uses elsewhere in his Gospel (cf. 1:51, 6:62, 9:35).[1]

The omission of these words in the witnesses cited above may have been an unintentional error on the part of an early scribe, but the possibility that the words were removed from the text out of reverential motives cannot be ruled out. If Pilate's words were understood as a rough jest, or if they were taken to mean that Jesus was merely a man, they might well be excised from the text. That such alterations were made by scribes in order to "improve" the text at certain points is apparent from other evidence.[2]

Matthew 24:36; cf. Mark 13:32

There was a decided tendency among early Christians to affirm the divine nature of Christ, often at the risk of losing sight of his humanity. This tendency has persisted down through the centuries and is reflected in certain textual variations, some of which are found in passages dealing with Jesus' knowledge of future events or other possibilities normally regarded as known only to God. In Matthew 24:36 many early witnesses read: "But of that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only." (RSV)[3] Other important witnesses omit the phrase "nor the Son," thus making it difficult to decide whether or not it stood in the original text of Matthew.[1] The phrase was certainly in the parallel text of Mark (13:32). Hence, the point at issue is whether it was omitted by Matthew because it implies a limitation of Jesus' knowledge as to the time of the *parousia* or whether scribes who found it in the text of Matthew omitted it because it did not support their own belief in Jesus' omniscience.

---

[1] See Barrett, St. John, p. 450.

[2] See the discussion of this variant by Porter, "Textual Analysis," pp. 205 f.

[3] Attested in the first hand of S B D Koridethi et al., fam. 13 (except 69) 28 et al., the Old Latin (pler.), the Vulgate (4 MSS.) Armenian, Tatian, Irenaeus, Origen, Ambrose, and Latin MSS. known to Jerome.

Scholars are divided in their opinion on this issue. Vincent Taylor thinks that "the textual evidence strongly supports the originality of the phrase in Matthew" but then suggests that it was wanting in the original text and "by assimilation to the text of Mark 13:32 was added in most textual families at a very early date."[2]

On the other hand, the same evidence has led others to conclude that the omission of the phrase "nor the Son" must be explained as a doctrinal modification of the original text in Matthew 24:36. Even Hort acknowledges the possibility of doctrinal influence here. In his notes on this passage he says, "Although assimilation to Mark would account for their presence if the attestation were unsatisfactory, their omission can be no less easily explained by the doctrinal difficulty which they seemed to contain."[3] With this judgment C.S.C. Williams concurs, for he thinks the words "nor the Son" were probably in the original and were perhaps omitted in some witnesses for reverential motives.[4] Origen found the words in the text which he used and discussed them at length in his Commentary on Matthew because of the theological difficulty raised by them.[1] It may well be that at an early stage, perhaps during the Arian controversy, these words were omitted in certain witnesses to the text of Matthew because they were regarded as an heretical interpolation.[2]

---

[1] Those omitting the phrase include a corrector of Sinaiticus, L W fam. 1 33 565 700 *et al.*, $g^{1.2}$ l r^2, the Vulgate (*pler.*), Syr. sin., Copt. boh. and sah., and Greek codices known to Jerome and Ambrose.

[2] Taylor, *Text*, p. 80; *idem*, *St. Mark*, p. 522.

[3] Hort, *Introduction*, Appendix, p. 18.

[4] Williams, *Alterations*, p. 38.

The textual evidence is much clearer in the parallel text of Mark (13:32). Here all the more important witnesses agree that Mark wrote "nor the Son" and only a few manuscripts omit the phrase (X 983 1689 and one Vulgate manuscript). The fact that the better-attested reading attributes a limitation of knowledge to Jesus and thereby raises the problem of reconciling this view with the commonly accepted belief in the divinity of Christ would probably explain why some witnesses omit the words in question.[3]

There is general agreement among scholars that these words were in the original text of Mark. It has been observed that Luke omits this entire verse in Mark, "perhaps because he did not care to affirm the ignorance of the Son."[4] The fact that Mark seems to give evidence of this limitation of Jesus' knowledge raised considerable difficulty for the church fathers, who felt it necessary to reject the Arian view of Christ. Ambrose regarded the phrase "nor the Son" as an Arian interpolation. (*De Fide*, V. 16) Others traced the Son's limitation of knowledge to the divine economy, or emphasized Christ's dependence on the Father's will.[5]

Most modern theologians would not hesitate to acknowledge this limitation of Jesus' knowledge as affirming the humanity of Christ, and would regard the better-attested longer reading in both Mark and Matthew as offering a valuable insight into an early Christian understanding of the person of Christ.

---

[1] Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 594 f.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 595.

[3] See Metzger, *Text*, p. 202.

[4] Creed, *St. Luke*, p. 258.

[5] Taylor, *St. Mark*, pp. 522 f.

John 6:64

The second half of John 6:64 attributes to Jesus a foreknowledge of men which could only be assigned to God. Most witnesses at this point read: "For Jesus knew from the first who those were that did not believe, and who it was that should betray him." (RSV) But in Codex Sinaiticus, followed by G and a few other manuscripts, the negative particle is omitted so that Jesus' foreknowledge is said to involve those who believed rather than those who did not believe. That the ordinary text was considered difficult for some early scribes is further indicated by the omission of the entire clause ("who they were that did not believe and") in the first hand of P66, one Old Latin manuscript (e), and the Old Syriac (sin. and cur.). Thus the doctrine of foreknowledge which is implied in the ordinary text of this verse may have been objectionable to certain scribes. Assuming that the longer text is closer to the original reading, the shorter reading could have arisen because an early scribe regarded the longer reading either as an interpolation or as an overstatement of Jesus' foreknowledge.[1] Perhaps all that can be said is that these variations of the text in John 6:64 raise the issue of Jesus' foreknowledge and of the doctrine of foreknowledge in general and that the different forms of the text witness to different interpretations of these doctrines as held by Christians in the early centuries of the church.

---

[1] But see John 2:25; cf. 13:11.

John 7:1

The majority of manuscripts, versions, and fathers gives us the following reading in the second half of John 7:1: " . . . he would not go about in Judea, because the Jews sought to kill him." (RSV) But several important witnesses, including the Washington Codex, two Old Latin manuscripts (a b), Syr. cur., Chrysostom, and Augustine, support a variant reading (εἶχεν ἐξουσίαν in place of ἤθελεν) in this passage, which offers a different point of interpretation. This variant reading would explain Jesus' avoidance of Judea by asserting that "he did not have the 'right' (or authority) to go about in Judea, because the Jews sought to kill him."

C. K. Barrett favors the latter reading as original, despite the overwhelming support for the ordinary text at this point.[1] Although a good case can be made for the priority of the second reading, it is at least as probable that this variant arose in order to provide a more acceptable explanation of Jesus' avoidance of Judea at this particular time. The better-attested reading implies that Jesus wished to avoid a confrontation with the Jews because they were determined to kill him. The implication of this comment apparently gave rise to the alternative reading which explains Jesus' action on the ground that his career followed a predetermined course. This would free him of any compromise on his part which the first reading might imply.[2] Thus the second reading may be understood as an example of doctrinal alteration of the text for the purpose of guarding against any interpretation that might bring reproach upon the person of Christ.

---

1. See Barrett, St. John, pp. 255 f., for his discussion of this choice of variant readings.

2. Porter, "Textual Analysis," p. 199.

John 7:8

There is a well-known difficulty in the text of this verse. Some early witnesses attest the following reading: "Go to the feast yourselves; I am not going up to the feast, for my time has not yet fully come." (RSV) This reading is supported by Codices Sinaiticus and Bezae, some Old Latin manuscripts, Syr. sin. and cur., the Vulgate and the Copt. boh. But an alternate reading is attested in some of our best witnesses, which substitute οὔπω for οὐκ (P66 P75 B W Koridethi *et al*.). The difficulty involved in accepting the first reading arises from the statement in verse 10 that Jesus did go up to the feast ("not publicly but in private") after his brothers had gone. Thus the reading which employs the simple negative pointed to what must have appeared to some scribes as an inconsistency between Jesus' words and his actions. The knowledge that Porphyry, the Neo-Platonist of the third century, used this inconsistency in his attack upon the Gospels (Jerome, *Against the Pelagians*, II. 17) has led some scholars to conclude that this gave rise to the variant "not yet" which is found in so many manuscripts and versions.[1]

However, this argument for the priority of the first reading with the explanation that it was altered in order to offset this attack by Porphyry has been challenged on the ground that both P66 and P75, which are at least a half century earlier than Porphyry (d. 304), support the reading "not yet" in verse 8.[2]

---

1. See, e.g., Howard, "St. John," pp. 579 f.; Metzger, *Text*, p. 202.

2. See the discussion of this variant in Porter, "Textual Analysis," pp. 199-201, who suggests that neither reading is actually less difficult than the other but prefers the reading found in P66 and P75.

It is clear, however, that Porphyry was not the first to recognize the inconsistency suggested by the first reading in the light of verse 10. The difficulty could easily be removed by the substitution of one word, thus making the first part of Jesus' assertion in verse 8 conform to the condition described in the second part: "I am not yet going up to the feast, for my time has not yet fully come."

The choice of readings in this verse will depend in part also upon the critic's understanding of what the Fourth Evangelist would likely have written. The latter may not have regarded Jesus' words in verse 8 as contradicting the action stated in verse 10. Jesus' refusal to go up at the request of his brothers implies that his moves are not directed by any human authority or in response to human--and unbelieving--advice, but in complete obedience to his father (cf. 2:4, 11:6).[1]

The possibility remains that some scribes who transmitted this passage brought to their task certain views or biases concerning Jesus which could have led them to believe that the text as it stood in manuscripts known to them was capable of misinterpretation. The conclusion of the present writer is that the simple negative particle ("not") stood in the text of the earliest copies of the Gospel and that the text was altered in certain manuscripts in order to avoid a possible misinterpretation or misuse of this passage in discussing or formulating the doctrine of the person and work of Christ.

Mark 3:21

The NEB translates this verse in such a way as to bring out the full meaning of the original. "When his family heard of this, they set out to take charge of him; for people were saying ~~that~~ he was out of his mind." Streeter has pointed out that Mark probably does not attribute to the family of Jesus this rather stark saying about him, and that his use of the third person plural (ἔλεγον) should be understood in an impersonal sense (cf. the French _on_ _disait_).[1] It is possible, however, that Matthew and Luke understood Mark's statement as meaning that Jesus' family thought him out of his mind, for an examination of synoptic parallels reveals that both Matthew and Luke omit any reference to this statement in Mark. A further glance at Nestle's textual apparatus on this verse also reveals that certain scribes felt the difficulty implied in Mark's statement. The resulting variations in the text at this point represent an attempt to avoid that implication, probably out of reverence for the person of Christ. For example the Washington Codex, Bezae, and some Old Latin manuscripts read: "When the scribes and the others heard it, they came to seize him, for they said, 'they [the crowd] are attached to him' (W), _or_ 'he has made them mad'" (D*).

---

[1] See Barrett, St. John, p. 258.

Luke 2:40

In this summary passage Luke describes for his readers the development of Jesus in his early years: "And the child grew and became strong, filled with wisdom; and the favor of God was upon him." (RSV) The Koredethi manuscript and the great majority of Byzantine witnesses add "in spirit" following the words "and became strong." The longer reading was apparently derived from

---

[1] Streeter, _The Four Gospels_, p. 189; cf. Taylor, _St. Mark_, p. 236, who says that most commentators take οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ as the subject of ἔλεγον . Taylor himself rejects Streeter's suggestion that Mark would not likely have told the story, if he had meant what he is usually understood to mean.

Luke 1:80, which is another summary passage dealing with John the Baptist. However, Codex Bezae has a significant variant at the end of Luke 2:40, where this manuscript reads ἐν αὐτῷ instead of ἐπ' αὐτό. Thus the last clause of this verse in D reads: " . . . and the favor (or grace) of God was in him."[1] This alteration is slight, but not unimportant from a theological point of view. Eberhard Nestle once observed that the change in Codex Bezae is not accidental, as is shown by the corresponding change of ἐπ' to εἰς in Luke 3:22.[2]

The familiar reading in this passage suggests that Jesus was the recipient of God's favor while he grew up in the family circle at Nazareth. The entire verse is today valued as an early Christian testimony to the early years of Jesus' life. But the reading in Codex Bezae probably gives a new meaning to the last clause in that it makes Jesus the depository of God's grace in his own person. Such an interpretation would lend support to the church's teaching that Jesus was the embodiment of God's grace. The theological overtones of this variant in Codex Bezae are thus evident.

Luke 4:2

Luke's account of the temptation of Jesus, like that of Matthew, tells of his spending forty days in the wilderness without food. Matthew says that he "fasted" forty days and forty nights, while Luke writes: "And he ate nothing in those days; and when they were ended, he was hungry." (RSV, vs. 2b) Some witnesses (fam. 13 69 122 124 346 *et al*.) contain an interesting addition to the text of this passage. By the insertion of two words (οὐδὲ ἔπιεν) these authorities tell us that Jesus neither ate nor drank anything during forty days. The effect of this addition is to heighten the miraculous element in Luke's account and, at the same time, to emphasize Jesus' power over his physical needs. It would also provide an argument for the deity of Christ at the expense of his humanity.

---

[1] Some Old Latin manuscripts and the Vulgate also read: *in illo* (f ff^2 g$^{1.2}$). Others read: *cum eo* (b c d q), *cum illo* (l), *super eum* (a), *super illum* (e).

[2] Nestle, *Introduction*, p. 269.

On the other hand, this variant may reflect the practice of fasting among certain Christians, who observed more stringent requirements, including abstinence from drink for extended periods of time. The presence of a reading in the text of the Gospel of Luke which states that Jesus did not eat or drink during forty days would, in any case, lend support to the views of increasing numbers of Christians in the early church who were turning to asceticism as a means toward a more disciplined and holy life.

John 1:34

According to the Fourth Evangelist, John the Baptist was among those who gave public testimony to Jesus. Thus he writes: "And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God." (RSV) At least, this is the reading found in most authorities. But a significant variation is found in P5, Codex Sinaiticus, the Old Syriac (sin. and cur.), one Old Latin manuscript (e), and Ambrose, which reads "the Chosen of God" in place of "the Son of God." The NEB follows this reading, thus rejecting the traditional text at this point. According to R.V.G. Tasker, the decision was made on the ground that "chosen" was more likely to have been altered to "Son" than vice versa.[1]

---

[1] See Tasker, The Greek New Testament, p. 425, who states further that eklectos "is in harmony with what would appear to have been the early tradition about the significance of the heavenly voice at Jesus' baptism." Cf. Barrett, St. John, pp. 148 f.

The word eklectos is not used elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel. In this context its meaning would not differ greatly from the more familiar reading "Son," except that it points more clearly than "Son" to the messianic status of Jesus.[1] If eklectos stood in the original text of John 1:34, it is likely that the alternative reading was introduced because of the serious objection to a term which might seem to support an Adoptionist Christology. Some early Christians would have taken exception to any reference to Jesus as the "Chosen."[2]

On the other hand, if the Fourth Evangelist wrote "Son of God" in this passage, then the alternative reading may have been substituted by an early scribe who thought that it was more fitting to refer to Jesus as the "Elect of God" or by one who believed that Jesus had been chosen to be the Messiah. Thus the reading ἐκλεκτός may have arisen as a result of the influence of the Ebionite movement. Or else "we may connect this variant with what Harnack regards as the Adoptionist stage in early Christology, corrected later on in the teaching of the Church and the revision of the text."[3]

Of the two readings cited, whichever one is accepted as the original, it is evident that the variant reading in each case can be explained as an alteration of the text in the interest of doctrine. Furthermore, the choice of readings here was likely a matter of important consequence in the early stages of the Christological controversy.[1]

---

[1] Barrett, St. John, p. 149.

[2] See Burkitt, Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, p. 309, who thinks that "Son" replaced "Chosen" because the latter "appeared to be an Adoptionist phrase, or at least to imply that there was a time or state in which He existed before God chose Him."

[3] Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine," p. 7.

Luke 3:22

The Lukan account of the voice from heaven at Jesus' baptism is identical with that of Mark, according to reliable witnesses which read: "Thou art my beloved Son; with thee I am well pleased." (RSV, vs. 22b)[2] Most editors of the Greek text, as well as English translators, prefer this reading because of its widespread support. But there is a significant variant reading found in several Western authorities (D a b c ff^2 l r, Justin, Clement and others), which is translated: "My Son art thou; this day I have begotten thee." (NEB mg.)

Some notable scholars, including Zahn, Harnack, and Streeter have favored the Western reading because of its support in such early witnesses as Justin and Clement of Alexandria and because it would be considered open to doctrinal objection and therefore assimilated to Matthew and Mark.[3] Streeter stated as one of his arguments for the priority of this reading that it could readily be quoted in support of the view, afterwards regarded as heretical, that Christ became the Son of God only at his baptism.[4]

But against the position of Streeter we must consider the possibility that the Western reading in Luke 3:22 is the result of an assimilation to the text of Psalm 2:7.[1] It is generally acknowledged that Justin Martyr was familiar with the Western variant in Luke 3:22. However, as Lagrange observed, Justin loved to combine the Old with the New Testament and he may have been the first to combine Psalm 2:7 with Luke 3:22.[2]

---

[1] See Harris, Sidelights, pp. 33 f., for an account of Justin's _Dialogue with Trypho the Jew_ as it relates to this passage.

[2] While other translations are possible (as given in the first footnote on this verse in the RSV), the meaning is about the same. Goodspeed translates: "You are my Son, my Beloved! You are my Chosen!" The NEB translates: "Thou art my Son, my Beloved; on thee my favour rests."

[3] See, for example, Streeter, _The Four Gospels_, pp. 143, 188, who argued that Luke derived his account of the baptism from "Q"; hence, the unique reading in Luke.

[4] _Ibid._, p. 143.

It is nonetheless true that the Adoptionists would have welcomed such a reading in Luke 3:22 as that which was widely known in the West for at least three centuries, for it would have given support to their doctrine that Christ became the Son of God at some point during his earthly career. At the same time this variant would have been well received in Ebionite circles where the doctrine of the Virgin Birth was rejected in favor of the view that the Holy Spirit had descended upon Jesus for the first time at his baptism. Perhaps the most that can be said is that here, as elsewhere, there is evidence of an ambiguity in the textual tradition which implies a difference in theological interpretation between the original form of the text and the variation found in certain textual witnesses.

Romans 1:4

It has been suggested that Paul has made use of a brief Christological formula in Romans 1:3, 4, which consists of two lines in antithetical parallelism. This formula declares that Christ was

> in the sphere of the flesh, born of the family of David;
> in the sphere of the Holy Spirit, appointed Son of God.[3]

---

[1] This is the view expressed by Creed, St. Luke, p. 58; cf. Tasker, The Greek New Testament, p. 419; Williams, Alterations, pp. 45 f.

[2] M.-J. Lagrange, Critique Textuelle: La Critique Rationelle ("Introduction à l'Etude du Nouveau Testament," II; Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie., 1935), p. 171. Hereafter cited as Lagrange, Critique Textuelle.

[3] Barrett, Epistle to the Romans, p. 18.

We need not decide here whether or not Paul is making use of a formula known to Christians at Rome to which he has added his own touch. For our purpose it is sufficient to point out that the Greek word (ὁρισθέντος), which is here translated "appointed," apparently caused some concern among early scribes because of its use in this passage. The implication of Paul's words is that while Christ was *born* as Son of David, he was *appointed* Son of God, either at his baptism or, more likely, "after his resurrection from the dead."[1] This expression of a primitive adoptionism was not uncommon among the earliest Christians, as witness the saying attributed to Peter in Acts 2:36; but it would later be held suspect by Christians who held a definite view of the pre-existence of Christ, whom they affirmed as the eternal Son of God. Paul's own Christology lay somewhere between these two alternative views in that his words in Romans 1:3, 4 must be seen in the light of his other statements concerning the pre-existence of Christ (Phil. 2:5 ff.).

The translation of verse 4 in the RSV avoids some of the difficulty implied in the word "appointed" by employing the term "designated." The NEB goes a step further by translating "he was declared Son of God." Apparently, some scribes in the West were troubled by the meaning of ὁρισθέντος for they wrote *praedestinatus* (d e q, the Vulgate and Irenaeus$^{\text{lat.}}$), which means "predestined." This is equivalent to the Greek word προορισθέντος and it serves to "correct" any possible misinterpretation of the more familiar reading in the Greek text. This change in the text of some Western authorities was probably made in order to weaken the suggestion that Jesus was "appointed" Son of God by his resurrection from the dead and to reaffirm the belief that his Sonship was "established beforehand" and was in no way dependent upon events related to his earthly career or his Resurrection. Such an "improvement" in the text of a passage containing an early Christological affirmation will doubtless be recognized as having theological implications.

---

[1] Barrett, *Epistle to the Romans*, pp. 19 f.

I John 4:3

In the later New Testament books certain second-century theological issues are reflected. These issues are likewise reflected in some textual variants. The author of I John is deeply concerned with the problem of "false prophets" who denied that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh. It is generally agreed that his opponents held a docetic view of Christ, i.e., they taught that Christ did not have a genuine corporeal existence but only seemed to be a man of flesh. Hence, the warning against such prophets is given in I John 4:1 ff. (Cf. II John 7.) Verse 3 reads: " . . . and every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God." (RSV) But there is a significant variant in verse 3a which is attested in the Vulgate and in the Latin translation of Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Origen. It reads: " . . . and every spirit which dissolves (Latin *solvit*) Jesus is not of God." The word *solvit*, according to some scholars, represents the Greek word λύει, which has several possible meanings.[1] The early fathers who quoted this form of the text understood it as referring to those who separate the divine from the human in Christ or who make a distinction between Jesus and Christ as the Docetists did.[2] The variant is early since it is attested in the Latin text of both Irenaeus and Clement, but most scholars reject it as the original reading, not only because all extant Greek codices support the more familiar form of the text but "because it does not make clear sense to say 'divide Jesus' (as it might if it read, 'divide Jesus Christ')."[1] It is perhaps easier to explain λύει as an alteration of the text at an early stage when docetism was still a serious threat to the "orthodox" view of Christ than to suppose that it was the original reading and was changed to the more familiar μὴ ὁμολογεῖ .[2] On the other hand, the correction of μὴ ὁμολογεῖ to λύει , if the latter was understood to mean "divide" or "separate," would give special point to this passage as a condemnation of a Christological view which was under attack during the second century.

---

[1] See Brooke, *Johannine Epistles*, pp. 111-114; Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine," p. 14; Wilder, "Epistles of John," pp. 275 f.

[2] See, e.g., Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, III. 16. 8.

Luke 22:43, 44

This famous passage concerning which there is some doubt as to whether or not it belongs in the text of the Gospel of Luke appears, nevertheless, in almost all of the better known English translations of the New Testament.[3] The text of the RSV reads: "And there appeared to him an angel from heaven, strengthening him. And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly; and his sweat became like great drops of blood falling down upon the ground." The authenticity of these verses has been debated since ancient times. Hilary was aware that they "were not found in many Greek and Latin manuscripts" and Jerome noted that they were only found in "some" Greek and Latin exemplars.[1] They are absent from important uncials (B A W and a corrector of S) and minuscules (fam. 13 579 1070*), as well as several ancient versions (f, Syr. sin., Copt. sah. and boh.). The recently discovered Bodmer manuscript (P75) also omits these verses. Such an array of witnesses is indeed impressive. However, they are found in the original hand of S D L Koridethi 0171 fam. 1 157 the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Syr. cur. and pesh., Armenian, and several patristic writers (Justin, Tatian, Irenaeus, and Hippolytus). It would be extremely difficult to reach a decision concerning the original text on the basis of external evidence.

---

[1] Wilder, "Epistles of John," p. 275.

[2] But cf. Otto A. Piper, "I John and the Didache of the Primitive Church," JBL, LXVI (1947), 443-444, who argues that here λύει had the sense not of divide but of exorcize or anathematize. According to his view, the heretics are accused of presuming to "break the spell" or annul the authority of Jesus by demonic power. Misunderstanding of the Greek term led to the variants which exist, including our familiar reading.

[3] A notable exception is that of Goodspeed, who translated the text of Westcott-Hort.

Westcott and Hort, probably influenced by Codex Vaticanus and their unwillingness to admit the possibility of doctrinal alteration, bracket this passage and describe the contents as a fragment from the traditions which circulated alongside the canonical Gospels. They regarded these verses and the first sentence of Luke 23:34 as "the most precious among the remains of this evangelic tradition which were rescued from oblivion by the scribes of the second century."[2]

Other scholars since Westcott and Hort have taken a different point of view, though they cannot be said to represent a consensus. J. Rendel Harris was among the first to argue that these verses had been omitted in certain Alexandrian witnesses for doctrinal reasons.[3] In his opinion it was the Docetists who removed this passage from the text on the ground that it did not agree with their view of Christ, which would not have allowed the agony of Gethsemane. Streeter argued in favor of the inclusion of these verses in Luke on the basis of their attestation in manuscripts used by Justin, Tatian, Irenaeus and Hippolytus. He repeated the argument of Harnack that linguistically the passage betrays several characteristically Lukan expressions and called attention to the statement from Epiphanius that these verses were perplexing to some orthodox persons of his day as seemingly derogatory to the full divinity of Christ.[1] Streeter's own comment is:

---

[1] J. A. Fitzmyer, "Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Some Features of Our Oldest Text of Luke," CBQ, XXIV (1962), 177 f. Hereafter cited as Fitzmyer, "Papyrus Bodmer XIV."

[2] Hort, Introduction, Appendix, p. 67.

[3] Harris, "New Points of View," pp. 322 f.

> Presumably it seemed beneath the dignity of the Uncreated Word Incarnate to evince such a degree of πάθος ; and still more to require a created angel as a comforter. Hence there was every reason, if not for excising it from the text, at least for regarding MSS. in which it had been accidentally omitted as original.[2]

Maurice Goguel reached a similar conclusion regarding this passage. He maintains that "at a comparatively late period, when the idea of the divinity of Christ was definitely established, Jesus would not have been represented as being overwhelmed to the point of needing to be strengthened by an angel."[3] However, his suggestion that the omission of these verses in important Alexandrian witnesses may be attributed to the influence of the Athanasian orthodoxy is no longer tenable in view of their omission in the recently discovered P75, which is closely related to Codex Vaticanus and is considerably earlier than the Athanasian controversy.

---

1. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 137 f.; cf. Creed, *St. Luke*, p. 273, who writes: "They may be a very early 'Western' interpolation (so W.H.), or they may have been omitted in some Alexandrian texts for the same doctrinal motive which led St. John entirely to omit the agony and the prayer in the garden."

2. *Ibid*.

3. Maurice Goguel, *The Life of Jesus*, trans. by Olive Wyon (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933), p. 493, n. 1.

It is still an open question as to the original form of the text at this point in the Gospel of Luke.[1] However, the opinion of the present writer is that verses 43 and 44 can best be explained as belonging to the original text of Luke, having been omitted in certain early witnesses because of doctrinal interests. It is an indisputable fact that these verses played an important role in early Christological interpretation. Irenaeus is said to have appealed to them in his controversy with the Docetists.[2] Later, they apparently were used by the Arians to show that Christ, who was supposed to be the head of angels and principalities, was actually sustained by and thus subordinate to an acknowledged creature. Thus the ambiguity of the textual tradition, together with the testimony of early Christian writers, like Irenaeus and Epiphanius, is indicative of the importance of this passage in early Christological debates. That the inclusion or omission of these verses in the text of Luke has implications for the doctrine of Christ will hardly be denied.

John 14:30

There is an implied reference to the devil in John 14:30, where Jesus announces that "the ruler of this world is coming." The end of this verse continues: "He has no power over me." (RSV) This reading has the support of most ancient authorities and few would deny that it represents the original text of this verse. However, a noteworthy variant is found in Codex Bezae and one Old Latin manuscript (a), which by a slight addition reads: "He can find nothing in me." A third reading is attested in some Byzantine manuscripts (K Π 42 116 *et al.*), one Old Latin codex (f), the margin of Syr. pesh., the Armenian, and the Ethiopic versions, which makes Jesus say, "He will find nothing in me."

---

[1] V. Taylor, Text, p. 94, after stating the position of Westcott and Hort, says: "But since their day opinion has steadily mounted in favour of the genuineness of the passage." Cf. Williams, Alterations, pp. 6-8.

[2] Fitzmyer, "Papyrus Bodmer XIV," p. 178.

The reading in Codex Bezae may have arisen in order to clarify and interpret an admittedly vague statement in the ordinary Greek text--lit., "He has nothing in me." But, on the other hand, it appears to give a new and different meaning to the words of Jesus, a meaning which is even more explicit in the third reading cited above. These two variants represent Jesus as giving testimony to his innocence at the very time the "ruler of this world" is mentioned. The use of the future tense in the third reading--"he will find nothing in me"--may represent an identification of the "ruler of this world" with Jesus' enemies, who charged him with evil. Pilate is reported to have found Jesus innocent of the charges brought against him by the Jews (see John 19:4; cf. Matt. 27:18, 19; Luke 23:14, 15). Thus the variant in Codex Cyprius (K) and other witnesses provides a statement of Jesus' innocence from his own lips as he anticipates his trial and crucifixion.

Such alterations of the text as those in John 14:30 suggest again the freedom exercised by those who transmitted the text in their continuing effort to make the Scriptures clear and meaningful in their testimony to the church's Lord and Savior.

John 12:32

Most ancient authorities support the well-known reading in this verse: " . . . and I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself." (RSV) A significant variant, however, is found in P66 S D, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and certain other witnesses, which by dropping one letter in the Greek reads: " . . . and I . . . will draw all things (πάντα) to myself." This reading apparently arose at an early date, for its presence in many Western witnesses, as well as P66 and Sinaiticus, indicates that it could not have arisen later than A.D. 200. Despite its excellent support most critics reject it as not being the original, on the ground that the Evangelist is concerned in this verse with the universal range of the Atonement rather than the cosmic significance of Christ.[1] However, there is no lack of difficulty with the theological sense of the traditional reading, "all people." The second reading may have been introduced in order to give a more cosmic meaning to Jesus' words in the light of such an affirmation as is found in Colossians 1:16-17.

I Corinthians 10:9

Paul issued this solemn warning to his readers at Corinth, who were apparently making unwarranted use of their Christian liberty: "We must not put the Lord to the test, as some of them did and were destroyed by serpents." (RSV) These words are a clear reference to an episode described in Numbers 21:5 ff., where it is reported that Yahweh punished those who complained because there was no food and water in the wilderness. However, many ancient authorities read "Christ" in place of "Lord" in I Corinthians 10:9.[2] In these witnesses Paul's reference to the God of Israel in the Old Testament is altered so that it becomes a reference to Christ. The fact that Paul speaks allegorically of the Rock as Christ in the preceding lines (vs. 4) may have suggested to some scribes the use of the title "Christ" in verse 9. But this alteration goes beyond Paul's allegorical statement in verse 4, for it amounts to no less than an identification of Christ with the Lord, the God of Israel. It is true that the early church referred to Jesus as "Lord," a title which they also used in speaking of the God of Israel, but New Testament writers, at least, appear to have made a clear distinction between Jesus and God.

---

[1] See Howard, "St. John," p. 669.

[2] These include P46 D E F G K L *al. pler.*, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Syr. pesh. and hkl., Marcion, Irenaeus, Clement, Origen, and Ambrosiaster.

E. C. Blackman thinks that this variant may be a Marcionite alteration, as Epiphanius says, because "Lord" would in this context refer to the Creator, "and if Marcion was going to make any use of the passage at all he had to alter κύριον here, as he could have no object in exhorting his followers not to tempt the Demiurge."[1] Whether Marcion or some other is responsible for substituting "Christ" in place of "Lord" in this passage, it is clearly an example of doctrinal modification of the text in that it attributes to Christ what is otherwise assigned to God, both in Numbers 21:5 ff. and in Paul's use of this passage in I Corinthians 10:9.

Jude 5

Another passage in which the tendency to attribute to Jesus a significant role in Old Testament events is found in Jude 5, which reads in part: " . . . that he who saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe." (RSV) Here the translators of the RSV resorted to conjecture when they chose to read "he who" (ὁ) instead of a reading which is found in some textual witnesses.[2] If this is the original reading, then there is ample evidence to indicate that those who transmitted the text were unhappy with it. Codex Sinaiticus reads κύριος and Codex Ephraemi reads ὁ κύριος , which is also found in the greater number of Byzantine manuscripts. The former is preferred by more editors of the Greek text, including Westcott-Hort, Tischendorf, Weiss, and Nestle, and is the reading adopted by the translators of the NEB. Another reading which is attested in P72 is "God Christ," while "God" is found in Clement of Alexandria, a corrector of C, a few minuscules, and Syriac Philoxenian.

---

[1] Blackman, Marcion, pp. 164 f.

[2] This conjecture was suggested by Westcott and Hort. See their Introduction, Appendix, p. 106.

The most interesting variant from our point of view is found in Codices A and B, the Latin versions, and Origen, all of which read "Jesus" in this clause of Jude 5. Westcott and Hort, who regarded this as the best-attested reading, thought that it could only be a blunder.[1] Their unwillingness to admit the possibility of doctrinal alteration in this passage is astounding. If, as they suggested, the original text in this passage probably read ὁ , then this would account for the substitution of all other readings attested. But the context calls for a substitute reading like "God" or "Lord" since it refers to the deliverance of Israel from Egypt and the destruction of those who did not believe. The variant "Jesus" could only result from an interpretation of Old Testament events in the light of the Christian experience of salvation and substituting "Jesus" for what is better understood as "God" or "Lord" in referring to those events which culminated in the choice of Israel as God's people. It should also be noted that if "Lord" is original, as many critics believe, then the variant "Jesus" is an interpretation of "Lord" which attributes to Jesus what is otherwise assigned to the God of Israel who "saved a people out of the land of Egypt."

---

[1] Hort, Introduction, Appendix, p. 106.

I Timothy 3:16

The issue of whether or not the New Testament calls Jesus God is involved in the textual problem of certain passages, including I Timothy 3:16, which contains what many scholars believe is a quotation from a liturgical confession or hymn used in the early church.[1] The first line reads: "He was manifested in the flesh. . . ." (RSV) Here the RSV translates the Greek text of most Alexandrian witnesses (Codex Vaticanus is lacking here), except that "who" (RSV mg.) would be a more literal translation.[2] The relative pronoun is an obvious reference to Christ, as the full text of verse 16b indicates, especially if verse 16a is seen as an introduction to the liturgical confession but not a part of it.

A few witnesses (061 D, some Old Latin MSS and the Vulgate) give the neuter singular (ho) as the reading in this passage, probably to make the relative pronoun agree in grammatical gender with the word musterion in the previous line. Thus, if the original text read hos, the change to ho can be explained as a grammatical improvement in the text.[3]

The traditional reading at this point in the text is, of course, "God," a variant which has the support of most of the Byzantine manuscripts. The fact that the ERV translators adopted the reading "he who" and thus rejected the traditional reading led some critics to accuse the revisers of being Unitarians.[1] It is now recognized that the traditional reading in this verse is not an early one. Tischendorf cites Liberatus, archdeacon of Carthage in the sixth century, as saying that Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, was expelled by the Emperor Anastasius for changing "who" to "God" in this passage. Although this alteration may have occurred earlier as a scribal error by someone who mistook ΟC for Θ̄C, the change was, nonetheless, regarded as having doctrinal implications in some quarters, just as later the adoption of the earlier Alexandrian reading (hos) was thought by some critics to be theologically motivated.

---

[1] See Vincent Taylor, "Does the New Testament call Jesus God?" Expository Times, LXXIII (1961-62), 116-118; cf. Raymond E. Brown, "Does the New Testament Call Jesus God?" Theological Studies, XXVI (1965), 545-573. Hereafter cited as Brown, "Does the NT Call Jesus God?" See also Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, trans. by S. C. Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 306-314. Hereafter cited as Cullmann, Christology.

[2] This reading also has the support of the first hand of Codices A and G^P.

[3] William Bowyer in his critical edition of the Greek New Testament, published in 1763 in two volumes adopted this reading in place of "God," which was the traditional reading in the Received Text. See B. M. Metzger, Chapters in the History of New Testament Criticism (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963), p. 157.

In his discussion of the textual problem in this passage in his Plain Introduction (pp. 637 ff.) Scrivener acknowledges the weight of evidence in favor of the Alexandrian reading, which is now favored by most editors of the Greek text; but he adds this final comment: "I dare not pronounce θεός a corruption." (P. 642) It is not necessary to use the word "corruption" to describe this variant; however, there is every reason to regard it as a reading which adds a theological dimension to the interpretation of this passage in that the original reference to Jesus--"who was manifested in the flesh"--becomes an affirmation that "God was manifested in the flesh." Such an affirmation in this context would identify Jesus as God; yet there is little indication elsewhere in the New Testament that the primitive church used θεός in speaking of Jesus.[2]

---

[1] A. T . Robertson, Studies in the Text of the New Testament, p. 68.

[2] But see Brown, "Does the NT Call Jesus God?" who claims that in at

Jude 4b

At the end of verse 4 in the Epistle of Jude the author describes those who threatened to undermine the faith and life of the church as "ungodly persons who pervert the grace of our God into licentiousness and deny our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ." (RSV) Most of the Byzantine witnesses and Syriac Philoxenian insert θεόν following "Master." Perhaps the addition was made because δεσπότην was thought to refer to God while the remaining words refer to Christ. Thus the second half of this clause might be translated, " . . . deny the only Master and our Lord Jesus Christ." From this point of view the insertion would be of little consequence. But if "Master" goes with "Lord" as a description of Jesus Christ,[1] then the addition of θεόν after "Master" has heightened theological implications and would be translated: " . . . deny our only Master God and Lord, Jesus Christ."

F.H.A. Scrivener, who was one of the champions of the Received Text in the latter half of the nineteenth century, listed Jude 4 as a passage containing a variant which perhaps arose because of doctrinal preconceptions.[2]

Romans 9:5

In Romans 9:1-5 Paul shows his appreciation of the role of Israel in the divine economy and concludes his introduction to this section of his letter (chaps. 9-11) in verse 5b with a brief doxology. Thus he writes: " . . . to them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is

---

least eight passages in the New Testament Jesus is called God. These are: John 1:18, Tit, 2:13, I John 5:20, Rom. 9:5, II Pet. 1:1, Heb. 1:8-9, John 1:1, John 20:28. See pp. 545-573.

[1] It is thus understood in the RSV, ASV, ERV, Goodspeed, Moffatt, and the translation of the Vulgate by Ronald A. Knox.

[2] See Scrivener, Plain Introduction, p. 17.

the Christ. God who is over all be blessed for ever. Amen." (RSV, vs. 5)

Much controversy has centered upon the second half of this verse. The issue is whether or not the words "God . . . be blessed forever" are grammatically separate from the preceding statement concerning Christ. To put it another way, should the doxology here be set off from the rest of the verse by a period, as in the RSV and most modern English translations, or should these final words of verse 5 be seen as a part of the whole sentence which begins in verse 4, and therefore in apposition to "Christ"? The RSV mg. gives this second alternative translation: "Christ, who is God over all, blessed for ever." The problem is not solved by reference to the Greek because such punctuation is absent from the earliest manuscripts. Some early fathers, including Tertullian and Irenaeus (Latin translation), preferred the view that the closing words of verse 5 refer to Christ. Almost all of the Post-Nicene fathers likewise held this same view. The evidence in Eusebius' writings, however, seems to point to the fact that he took these words as referring to God, though he does not cite this passage.[1]

Editors of the Greek text are divided on this issue, which affects the interpretation of Romans 9:5. Tischendorf placed a full stop after "Christ according to the flesh" in his text, but Westcott and Hort adopted the punctuation which is found in the KJV: "Christ . . . , who is over all, God blessed for ever." In the margin, however, they recognize as of approximately equal validity the view that the final words of verse 5 refer to God and are thus separate from the preceding sentence. Weiss placed a comma after the phrase "according to the flesh."[2]

---

[1] See Hort, Introduction, Appendix, pp. 109 f.

[2] A third alternative punctuation is suggested in the following transla-

Since the issue involved is clearly demonstrated in the RSV and RSV mg., we shall focus attention briefly on the alternatives suggested by the translation in the text and in the margin of this English version.

The translation in the RSV text is open to objection on the ground that it differs from the grammar and style which are characteristic of Pauline doxologies. The latter are usually connected with the context and seem to arise out of the preceding words (cf. Rom. 1:25, II Corinthians 11:31).[1] On the other hand the translation in the RSV mg. introduces a theological element which is found nowhere else in Paul's letters. By allowing the doxology to refer to Christ, it would make Paul call Christ "God." It is true that the Apostle comes close to this (as in Phil. 2:6-11 and I Cor. 8:6); but he apparently stopped short of actually referring to Christ as God elsewhere in his writings. If he did so here, we might expect him to have done it in other contexts.[2]

John Knox cites Lietzmann as adopting the view which is supported by the RSV translators, but on other than linguistic or theological grounds. Noting the form of other doxologies, especially the Pauline ones (Rom. 1:25, 11:36; II Cor. 11:31; Gal. 1:5; Phil. 4:20), Lietzmann concluded that the evidence seems to preclude the reference of this doxology to Christ.[3] If this

---

tion: " . . . Christ according to the flesh, who is over all. God be blessed for ever"; but this possibility has little to commend it. (See Barrett, Epistle to the Romans, pp. 178 f.)

[1] Barrett, Epistle to the Romans, pp. 178 f.

[2] See John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans: Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick, et al. (12 vols.; New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954), IX, 540. Hereafter cited as Knox, "Romans." But see W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, ("ICC"; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), pp. 233-238, who think that the concluding words of verse 5 would naturally refer to Christ.

[3] Knox, "Romans," p. 540.

argument is sound, then the form of punctuation which is given in the RSV mg. and in the KJV represents an interpretation of Paul's doctrine of Christ which goes beyond any to be found elsewhere in his letters.

II Corinthians 10:1

Many scholars hold that chapters 10-13 of II Corinthians are part of a "stern" letter written by Paul while the bitter struggle for the loyalty of the Corinthian Church was at its height. The first verse of chapter 10 opens an appeal by the Apostle that the Corinthians may not force him to take stern action against those who suspected him of acting in a worldly fashion. (Vss. 1-2) In verse 1 he writes: "I, Paul, myself entreat you, by the meekness and gentleness of Christ. . . ." (RSV) Thus Paul prefers to "entreat" the Corinthians, using as his standard "the meekness and gentleness of Christ." Since "meekness and gentleness" are qualities associated with Jesus as he is presented in the Gospel narratives, it is interesting to find at least one manuscript (Codex 1780) which substitutes "God" for "Christ" in this passage.[1] Here it is evident that the scribe of this manuscript, or an earlier one, was motivated by doctrinal considerations. It would be unusual to ascribe such qualities as "meekness and gentleness" to God, but if one believed that Jesus was God, then he would not think it out of place to substitute "God" for "Christ" in this passage. This scribal change, perhaps no earlier than A.D. 1200, reminds us that alterations in the Greek New Testament continued to be made even as late as the Byzantine period.

---

[1] See Louis F. Gough, "The Text of the Earlier Pauline Epistles in the Duke New Testament," (unpublished B.D. thesis, Duke University, 1949), pp. 24 f.

I Peter 3:15a

The author of I Peter counsels his readers who are facing the test of persecution to have no fear of those who trouble them, "but in your hearts reverence Christ as Lord." (RSV) Here, again, many Greek manuscripts (K L P and the majority of Byzantine witnesses) have substituted "God" for "Christ"; the reading "Christ" is found in the best ancient Greek and Latin texts. Few, if any, scholars today would favor the reading θεόν , not only because "Christ" has better support but also because "Christ" would more likely be changed to "God" than the reverse.

Since this type of variant is not unique in the New Testament, it is possible to explain it as further evidence of a growing tendency in the church to refer to Christ as God. On the other hand, I Peter 3:14b, 15a is based upon Isaiah 8:12, 13, which refers to the Lord, the God of Israel. Thus the variant in verse 15a may represent an attempt to harmonize a passage in the New Testament with a parallel in the Old Testament. E. G. Selwyn cites Wand's suggestion "that the alteration was made by certain early copyists who feared that the passage went doctrinally too far."[1] In this view an early scribe altered the text because of his belief that "Peter" would not have written "Christ" where a reference to "God" seemed to be implied.

Galatians 2:20

The second half of this verse reads: " . . . and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." (RSV) The great majority of witnesses attest this reading, but a few very important manuscripts (P46 B D* G) read "the God and Christ" instead of "the Son of God" as the object of Paul's faith. There are two ways to translate this variant: "faith in God and in Christ who loved me and gave himself for me," or "faith in the God and Christ who loved me and gave himself for me." Only the second interpretation of this variant represents a significant theological difference in the text, for here the witnesses cited above seem to make Paul's words refer to Jesus as God. Most critics reject this reading probably on the ground that "Son of God" suits the context better and avoids the appearance of alteration for doctrinal reasons. Moreover, the phrase "the God and Christ" is not found elsewhere in Paul's writings and is therefore suspect.[1]

---

[1] See E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (2nd ed.; London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1949), p. 193. Hereafter cited as Selwyn, *First Epistle of St. Peter*.

John 1:18

The issue of whether or not the New Testament calls Jesus God is involved in a significant textual variation in John 1:18. The traditional reading in this passage is reflected in the RSV translation: "No one has ever seen God; the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known." The NEB translators likewise adopted the reading ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός , which is found in a number of important witnesses (A W Koridethi fam. 1 fam. 13, most Byzantine MSS, the Latin versions, Syr. cur., and Copt. sah.). But the better-attested reading is μονογενὴς θεός which has the support of early Greek manuscripts (P75 P66 S B C L), Syr. pesh. and hkl. mg., Copt. boh., Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. This variant is sometimes translated "the only-begotten God." but it could be rendered "God the only

---

[1] Brown, "Does the NT Call Jesus God?" p. 552.

Son." It was regarded by Westcott and Hort as the more difficult reading and was adopted by them in their critical text. In their opinion it adds nothing to what the Evangelist has already said but simply combines in a single phrase the two attributes of the Logos mentioned in verses 1 and 14.[1] W. F. Howard calls attention to the absence of the article with θεός in verse 18 (cf. vs. 1) and suggests that it may be rendered with the following words: "He who is in the bosom of the Father, only-begotten, divine."[2]

On the other hand, the translators of the NEB are reported to have held that the best-attested reading "does not yield a tolerable sense."[3] C. K. Barrett, among others, thinks that υἱός is imperatively demanded by the following clause, and is in conformity with Johannine usage (3:16, 18; I John 4:9; cf. John 1:14).[4]

It is obvious that a real difficulty confronts the interpreter of this passage and part of that difficulty must have been felt by those who transmitted the text of this passage. Scrivener held that whatever conclusion we arrive at respecting the true reading, the discrepancy at this point could hardly have arisen except from doctrinal preconceptions.[5] Some critics have preferred the more familiar reading because they suspect that θεός was introduced into the text of some early manuscripts for doctrinal reasons, perhaps as an anti-Arian polemic. However, the Arians did not object to the use of "only-begotten God" because in their view this appellation distinguished the Son from the Father who alone was God in the highest sense--unbegotten, uncaused and without beginning. Moreover, the presence of this variant in the Bodmer papyri indicates that if it is a secondary reading, it must have been introduced at a very early date.

---

[1] Hort, *Introduction*, Appendix, p. 74.

[2] Howard, St. John," p. 479.

[3] Tasker, *The Greek New Testament*, pp. 424 f.

[4] Barrett, *St. John*, p. 141.

[5] See his *Plain Introduction*, pp. 17, 604-606. As in so many instances, he favors the traditional reading.

There is a third alternative reading, ὁ μονογενής, which is found in Tatian, Origen (once), Epiphanius, and Cyril of Alexandria. A few scholars have favored it as the original reading, of which the two readings cited above would represent an expansion and clarification.[1] The NEB translators gave it as an alternative reading in the margin. Apparently they felt that it might have given rise to the other two.[2] However, most critics agree that the original form of the text is probably represented by one or the other of the readings attested in the best Greek manuscripts and versions.

One important difference between the first two readings cited above is that while one refers to Jesus as "the only Son," the other, according to some scholars, ascribes to him the title "God," which is a rare phenomenon in the New Testament (cf. John 20:28).[3] But this tendency, which in the view of some scholars began in the later New Testament writings, was to continue until it culminated in the various expressions of Modalistic Monarchianism in the second and third centuries.

---

[1] R. E. Brown, "Does the NT Call Jesus God?" cites Boismard as an example. Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, p. 307, also favored this reading.

[2] See Tasker, *The Greek New Testament*, p. 425. He adds this interesting comment: "All three readings have patristic support, varying, it would seem, with the Christological emphasis of the particular writer."

[3] See, e.g., Cullmann, *Christology*, p. 309; Brown, "Does the NT Call Jesus God?" p. 554.

John 9:38, 39a

A variant which has some Christological significance is found in John 9:38, 39a, where a few important manuscripts (P75 S W b) omit the words: "And he said, 'Lord, I believe'; and he worshiped him. Jesus said . . . ." (RSV) Few textual scholars have taken the view that these witnesses preserve the original form of the text. Yet it is not impossible that these words were added by an early scribe in a spirit of adoration and reverence for the person of Jesus.[1]

It seems more likely that the form of the text which includes these words is closer to the original, for their inclusion does no violence to the context. Indeed the blind man's response, as stated in verse 38, is a proper answer to Jesus' question in verse 35. Perhaps they were omitted in certain early copies of the Fourth Gospel because of the possible difficulty of using the word "worshiped" with Jesus as the object. Some significance may be attached to the fact that whereas P75 and other Alexandrian witnesses in Luke 24:52 state that "they (the apostles) worshiped him and returned to Jerusalem with great joy," here in John 9:38 P75 S and W (which is Alexandrian in this part of John) omit any reference to the blind man's act of worship. Perhaps the discrepancy can be explained by supposing that some scribes thought it improper to worship Jesus while he was in the flesh, but entirely fitting to worship the Risen Lord (cf. Matt. 28:9, 17).

---

[1] See Porter, "Textual Analysis," p. 202, who thinks that the textual evidence supports this conclusion.

Matthew 25:1

This verse begins the parable of the Ten Maidens "who took their lamps and went to meet the bridegroom." (RSV) There is an interesting variant at the end of this verse found in Codex Bezae, the Koridethi manuscript and other Caesarean witnesses, the Latin versions, the Sinaitic Syriac, and the Armenian, all of which add the words "and the bride" after "the bridegroom." Sherman E . Johnson, among others, thinks that this reading is probably correct.[1] His view is that "the words 'and the bride' are missing in some MSS probably because 'the bridegroom' was understood as an allegorical reference to Christ, and the copyists could see no way of fitting the bride into the allegory."[2] The variant is well attested in all the major texts except the Alexandrian, but its absence from the latter is apparently sufficient for most editors of the Greek text and commentators to regard it as secondary. Streeter lists this verse among others in which Family Theta agrees with Syriac Sinaiticus in certain conspicuous insertions, which are found also in Codex Bezae (cf. Matt. 5:22, 10:23, 25:1; Mk. 10:24).[3]

Yet the intrinsic difficulty of this addition is an argument in its favor and the manuscript evidence for it is strong; therefore, the conclusion that it belongs to the original text is probably justified.[4] The idea was widely entertained by early Christians that Christ, the Bridegroom, would come at the last day to take his Bride, the Church, with him. Since the addition at the end of Matthew 25:1 seemed incompatible with the allegorical interpretation placed upon this parable, it may well have been omitted by some early scribes.

---

[1] See Johnson, "St. Matthew," p. 556. [2] Ibid.

[3] Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 89.

[4] So also Alan Hugh M'Neile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1915), p. 361.

The Death, Resurrection and Ascension of Christ

Mark 12:8; cf. Matthew 21:39, Luke 20:15

The text of this verse, which belongs to Mark's account of the parable of the Wicked Tenants reads: "And they took him and killed him, and cast him out of the vineyard." (RSV) Both Matthew and Luke have given an account of the same parable, but there are signs of development in each of them. For example, the ordinary text of Matthew 21:39 reads: "And they took him and cast him out of the vineyard, and killed him." (RSV) Thus according to most ancient authorities Matthew made a simple change in the word order of this sentence. But some Western codices (D a b e ff) and the Koridethi manuscript follow the reading in Mark exactly, so that C. H. Turner took this to be the original reading of Matthew.[1] According to this view, all other witnesses of Matthew have been assimilated to Luke 20:15a, which reads: "And they cast him out of the vineyard and killed him." (RSV) However, a comparison of the text of Luke cited here and the ordinary text of Matthew given above shows that they are not identical, as might be expected if one had been assimilated to the other. It is possible that Matthew and Luke have altered the text of Mark independently by changing the word order of Mark, so that this passage might be more fittingly applied to Jesus, who had suffered "outside the camp." (Cf. the text of P46 and P in Heb. 13:12.)[1] Thus we have here one of several instances where the text of Mark has been altered by the other Synoptists, or else we can take the view that Matthew 21:39 is correctly preserved in certain Western witnesses and the Koridethi manuscript while all other ancient authorities attest a reading which may reflect a desire to bring this parable into closer agreement with the tradition that Christ "suffered outside the gate" (Heb. 13:12). The latter alternative would mean that the majority of ancient witnesses in Matthew 21:39 have transmitted a reading which has theological implications for the death of Christ not discernible in the alternative form of the text.

---

[1] Williams, Alterations, p. 37. V. Taylor, St. Mark, p. 475, also thinks that the Western reading in Matthew is probably the correct one.

Mark 15:34

Leaving aside the complex question of whether Jesus spoke Hebrew or Aramaic when he uttered the cry of dereliction from the Cross, the Markan account, as given in Alexandrian witnesses, reads: "And at three o'clock Jesus called out loudly, '*Eloi*, *Eloi* *lema* (*lama*) *sabachthani?*' which means, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'" The Western scribes, on the other hand, preferred to represent Jesus as using the Hebrew rather than the Aramaic of Psalm 22:2 (LXX, Psa. 21:2), which apparently was in the mind of Jesus when he was dying.

Of more importance to this study is the fact that some Western manuscripts (D c i k) and Porphyry apparently altered the text of the last clause in verse 34 to read: "My God, my God, why hast thou *reproached* me?" Although Nestle could find no satisfactory explanation for this reading,[2]

---

[1] Williams, *Alterations*, p. 37.

[2] See Nestle, *Introduction*, p. 266.

C.S.C. Williams has suggested that it might be derived from Psalm 78:12 (LXX) or from Psalm 88:51 f. (LXX) with its striking reference to the "Christ."[1]

It is unlikely that Codex Bezae and its allies have preserved the original form of the text at this point and that all other witnesses have been assimilated to the text of Psalm 22. Although some scholars are willing to accept the Western reading elsewhere in this verse because it reproduces the Hebrew of Psalm 22:2 (e.g., Dalman and C. H. Turner), few would contend that this variant in Codex Bezae (ὠνείδισας in place of ἐγκατέλιπες) is to be accepted. Perhaps a better explanation for the reading in D and its allies (c i k) is that offered in the following statement by Williams:

> The Western text avoids the implication that the Father deserted the Son even for one moment on the cross, the scribe missing the point that the opening words of the Psalm were intended by Mark to indicate that the whole poem was in Jesus' mind. As a whole the poem is the expression of confidence in the help of God brought to the stricken and not of utter despair and desolation.[2]

Hebrews 2:9

There is an interesting variant in the last clause of this verse, which is concerned with a particular theological view of Christ's death. The ordinary text reads: " . . . so that by the grace of God he might taste death for every one." (RSV) A few witnesses, however, read "apart from God"

---

[1] See Williams, Alterations, p. 40, who adds this comment: "The early Christians dwelt upon the 'reproach of Christ,' which Moses by faith regarded as richer than the treasures of Egypt (Heb. 11:26)."

[2] Ibid. See also Taylor, St. Mark, pp. 593 f. The NEB translators considered this variant in D c i k and Porphyry as "an attempt to avoid the supposition that Jesus on the cross was abandoned by God." (Tasker, The Greek New Testament, p. 416.)

(χωρὶς θεοῦ) instead of "by the grace of God" (M 424^{c} $1739^{mg.}$, Syr. pesh. $\text{Origen}^{pt.}$, Eusebius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Greek MSS known to Jerome and Ambrose). This reading was found in the majority of manuscripts known to Origen while he was still writing in Alexandria.[1] However, Origen was aware of both readings in Hebrews 2:9 and was not interested in deciding between them, for he found spiritual significance in both of them.[2] Westcott and Hort accepted the more familiar reading with the explanation that χωρίς probably arose from a confusion of letters in some early manuscripts.[3] On the other hand Harnack preferred the latter reading and apparently thought that the text had been altered for the same reason which led to the suppression in some texts of the Lukan account of the agony in the garden (Luke 22:43-44).[4]

If the original text read χωρὶς θεοῦ, it may have been difficult to understand and would thus have been changed in order to yield a simpler text. Origen thought it meant that Jesus tasted death for everyone "except God," but other interpretations are possible. Moffatt pointed out that the meaning of this reading may be (1) "forsaken by God" (cf. Mark 15:34), (2) "apart from his divinity," or (3) "except God," which was Origen's view, and he suggested that only (1) and (3) are tenable.[5] It is known that this reading was favored by the Nestorians and this may have prompted others in the church to question it. Most critics seem to think, however, that the better-attested reading, "by the grace of God," is primary and that the variant χωρίς arose either as a transcriptional error (Westcott-Hort) or as a marginal gloss on the closing words of verse 8, which was later introduced into the text.[1]

---

[1] Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine," p. 15.

[2] Metzger, *Text*, p. 152.

[3] Hort, *Introduction*, Appendix, p. 129.

[4] Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine," p. 15.

[5] James Moffatt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* ("ICC"; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), XV, 27.

Whichever reading is accepted as the original, it would seem that the less familiar one may have risen or fallen because of doctrinal interests. Some, like the Nestorians, favored it because it gave support to their views. Others may have rejected it because of its popularity among the heretics or because it implied that Jesus had been abandoned by God when he suffered death on the Cross.

I Peter 2:21, 3:18

These are two verses which refer to the death of Christ either implicitly or explicitly. In 2:20 f. the author counsels his readers to suffer patiently the wrongs inflicted upon them: "For to this you have been called because Christ also suffered for you. . . ." (RSV, vs. 21) The scribe of Codex Sinaiticus, however, drawing upon 3:18, wrote "Christ died" instead of "Christ suffered." This variant is also attested in Syr. pesh. and Ambrosiaster. Most other ancient authorities support the reading which is translated in the RSV.

A few witnesses, including Syr. pesh., substitute "us" in place of "you" twice in this verse, thus reading: "Christ also suffered (died) for *us*, leaving *us* an example. . . ." But most Byzantine manuscripts and the Clementine Vulgate read: "Christ also suffered for *us*, leaving *you* an example. . . ."

In I Peter 3:18 the witnesses are more evenly divided in their support for existing variants. Codices Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Ephraemi, and the Latin and Syriac versions read "Christ died," while "Christ suffered" is found in B K L P and most late Greek manuscripts. Both the RSV and the NEB read "Christ died" in this passage and the weight of evidence seems to favor this choice. The context would permit either reading but the one adopted by the RSV translators is preferable in the immediate context of verse 18.

---

[1] Taylor, *Text*, p. 105, thinks that the latter would explain the origin of this variant.

Following some witnesses, the RSV reads: "For Christ also died for sins, once for all . . . "; "for sins" is attested by B K P, most late Greek manuscripts and some manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate. However, other translators prefer the alternative reading, "for our sins," which is found in 5, some manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate, Syr. pesh., Copt. sah. and Clement. This reading is regarded by many textual critics as secondary, but it was placed in the text of the NEB. Other less significant variants occur in the text of this verse. They all add up to the fact that those who transmitted the text at this point did not regard their work merely as a mechanical task but felt compelled to make this passage of Scripture, which is rich in doctrinal content, even more relevant to the needs and interests of Christian believers.

I Peter 3:19

One method of arriving at the original text of the New Testament is that of conjectural emendation. Almost all textual critics have to some extent made use of this method, but it was especially popular in the latter part of the nineteenth century.[1] However, in recent decades fewer scholars have felt the need to resort to conjecture as a means of establishing the text because of the amount of textual evidence available.

---

[1] The apparatus of the twenty-fifth edition of Nestle's Greek New Testament includes from various sources about two hundred conjectures, ninety of which are identified by the name of the author who suggested them.

One emendation which has perhaps enjoyed the favor of more scholars than any other is the suggestion that the name "Enoch" has fallen out of the text of I Peter 3:19. The ordinary text of this verse reads: " . . . in which he went and preached to the spirits in prison." (RSV) William Bowyer was apparently the first to suggest the restoration of the name "Enoch" in the second edition of his Critical Conjectures.[1] Since then a large number of scholars have accepted this emendation and at least two English translators, Moffatt and Goodspeed, have introduced it into their text. Goodspeed argues that the independent judgment of so many scholars who have approved this emendation makes it almost certainly the correct reading in this passage.[2] But this judgment of eminent scholars like J. Cramer, M. R. James, J. Rendel Harris, and others has been questioned more recently by E. G. Selwyn, F. W. Beare, and other commentators.[3] Objection to the insertion of "Enoch" into the text of this verse is based on at least two arguments: "(1) the allusion to Enoch would be abrupt and unprepared for; (2) Enoch is represented in the Book of Enoch and elsewhere as proclaiming doom and nothing else on the fallen angels."[4] The first of these arguments against the proposed emendation of the text here is especially weighty, for the addition of "Enoch" would introduce a new subject into an otherwise smooth context and thus break the continuity of what appears to be an exposition of the work of Christ.[1]

---

[1] See B. M. Metzger, "Three Learned Printers and Their Unsung Contributions to Biblical Scholarship," Journal of Religion, XXXII (1952), 256; idem, Text, p. 185.

[2] See the discussion of this verse in E. J. Goodspeed, Problems of New Testament Translation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), pp. 195-198.

[3] See E. G. Selwyn, First Epistle of St. Peter, pp. 197 f.; F. W. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter (2nd ed.; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), pp. 144-147.

[4] Selwyn, First Epistle of St. Peter, p. 198.

If "Enoch" once stood in the text of this verse, its disappearance could be accounted for by postulating a simple scribal error, and yet its exclusion or inclusion affects the interpretation of this passage as it relates to the doctrine of the Descent of Christ into Hades, which has captivated the imagination of many generations and has even found a place in the Creed.

It would be impossible to discuss here the various interpretations that have been placed upon this verse. But all these interpretations become superfluous if we suppose that the original text read: "In it Enoch went and preached even to those spirits that were in prison." (Goodspeed)

Romans 6:9

According to all Greek manuscripts and most versions, Paul used the passive form of the verb which is so often employed in the New Testament in referring to the Resurrection of Christ. Thus he writes: "For we know that Christ being raised from the dead will never die again; death no longer has dominion over him." (RSV, cf. 9:4, 8:34) Since the passive form ἐγερθείς is used here as elsewhere, the implication is that Christ was truly dead and needed some power other than himself to raise him up to live again. This must have been clear to Marcion, for he altered the text at this point by substituting ἀναστάς for ἐγερθείς.[2] E. C. Blackman lists this passage among those which in his opinion contain Marcionite tendentious emendations that have affected non-Marcionite texts.[1] He suggests the possibility that Marcion's reading in Romans 6:9 may have influenced the text of certain Old Latin manuscripts which give surgens as the reading here (d m e r). Other Western witnesses (f g, Irenaeus, Ambrosiaster, and Ambrose) give a similar reading, resurgens.[2]

---

[1] Metzger, Text, p. 185, n. 1; cf. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter, p. 145, who says, "It is impossible to see what relevance Enoch's visit to Hades could have for him (the author of I Peter) in this connection. The conjecture is therefore to be discarded."

[2] Harnack, Marcion, p. 105*.

The variant which is found in Marcion and other Western authorities in Romans 6:9 does appear to have some importance for the doctrine of the Resurrection of Christ; for this reading, particularly when it is substituted for the better-attested reading, suggests that the initiative in Christ's Resurrection was his own and not the working of some power which lay outside of him. It is true that the same Greek verb used by Marcion in an active sense was at times employed by New Testament writers in referring to the Resurrection of Christ, but the passive form is much more common. That Marcion employed the active verb in the formulation of his theology is generally known.

Further evidence that Marcion preferred not to speak of Jesus being "raised" from the dead may be seen in the text of Galatians 1:1, where he alone has omitted the words "and God the Father" with the result that here again the text is made to support Marcion's belief that Christ raised himself from the dead by his own power.[3] Such alterations of the text provide unmistakable evidence that Marcion was motivated by doctrinal considerations even in his treatment of the letters of Paul which he accepted as scripture.

---

[1] Blackman, Marcion, pp. 161, 168.

[2] Ibid., p. 161. A further counsel by Blackman: "But too much must not be made of the agreement of d f g with Marcion, as even Vg. has surgens. Also Marcion did not alter Rom. 7:4; 8:11." (P. 161)

[3] It is Jerome who explains this omission by Marcion. See Clark, "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation," p. 6. Concerning this variant in Galatians 1:1, E. C. Blackman says, "This verse is indicative of Marcion's

Luke 16:30, 31

An indication that early scribes were sensitive to the use of the proper verb form (active or passive) in passages where the Resurrection of Christ is alluded to may be seen in the variations which are present in Luke 16:30, 31. In verse 30 the ordinary text reads: " . . . but if someone goes to them from the dead, they will repent." (RSV) But Codex Sinaiticus has "rises" (ἀναστῇ) in place of "goes" (πορευθῇ) and P75 attests still another reading, "is raised" (ἐγερθῇ). Again, P75 and one minuscule (579) have "is raised" instead of the active verb at the end of verse 31 where most witnesses read: " . . . neither will they be convinced if some one should rise from the dead." (RSV) In both verses the scribe of P75 uses the passive form of the verb meaning "to raise up," which is more commonly used in the New Testament when the subject is Christ. It shows how prominent was the thought of resurrection in the mind of this scribe or a previous one.[1] That the scribe wished to make the text conform to what he believed had happened in the Resurrection of Christ seems to explain these variations found in P75.

John 2:22a

This passage is another of those which contain variations affecting

---

modalistic Christology. It also gives expression to his theory that Christ raised himself from the dead, and depended for nothing on the Creator." See his Marcion, p. 44, n. 2.

[1] M. A. King, "Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript of Luke," Bibliotheca Sacra, CXXII (1965), 239 f.

the doctrine of the Resurrection of Christ. The ordinary text reads: "When therefore he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this. . . ." (RSV) It is all but certain that this is the correct reading where the text has "was raised," for it is attested in all early Greek manuscripts, versions, and fathers with the exception of the Washington Codex and Chrysostom, both of which substitute the active verb meaning "he rose up." The latter reading suggests here that Christ "rose up" from the dead by his own power. This idea is not entirely alien to the view expressed elsewhere by the author of the Fourth Gospel. In John 20:9 he writes: "For as yet they did not know the scripture, that he must rise from the dead." (RSV) (Cf. John 10:17, 18.)

The significance of the variant found in the Washington Codex and Chrysostom is that in some circles as late as the fourth or fifth century it was possible to alter the text of a passage dealing with the Resurrection of Christ to allow for the interpretation that Christ "rose up" from the grave in place of the more common reading which declares that "he was raised" from the dead.[1]

Matthew 16:21, 17:23, 20:19, 17:9

There are a few passages in the text of the Synoptic Gospels where the active verb has been substituted for the passive in describing the Resurrection of Christ. The Resurrection is mentioned explicitly in six passages in the Gospel of Mark, three times in the announcements concerning the Passion (8:31, 9:31, 10:34), once in the remark by Jesus following upon the Transfiguration on the mountain (9:9), once in a statement attributed to Jesus which implies that a resurrection appearance is to occur in Galilee (14:28), and the announcement to the women at the tomb (16:6). In the first four instances Mark almost certainly employed the active verb, while in the last two the passive verb is used. It is interesting to note that the text of Mark in each of these cases was transmitted rather faithfully by the scribes; but when we turn to the text of Matthew in those passages where the Resurrection is explicitly mentioned, the textual problem becomes much more complicated.

---

[1] See the discussion of this variant in Porter, "Textual Analysis," p. 194.

Matthew repeats each of these six references to the Resurrection of Christ (16:21, 17:23, 20:19, 17:9, 26:32, 28:6), and, according to the best known editions of the Greek text (Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, Nestle, etc.), Matthew employed the passive verb in every case. But the textual evidence is divided, especially in the first four passages (16:21, 17:23, 20:19, 17:9) where some important witnesses substituted the active verb for the passive. Such changes might be explained as nothing more than an assimilation of the text of Matthew to that of Mark, but the evidence from other passages in the Gospels where the original text gives the passive verb (e.g., Luke 9:22, John 2:22) points to the conclusion that later scribes preferred the use of the active verb in passages describing the Resurrection of Christ. On the other hand, where the active verb stands in the original text there seems to have been little desire to change it.[1]

In the opinion of many modern scholars the earliest Christian proclamation was that Jesus was "raised up" (cf. Acts 2:24, I Cor. 15:4).[2]

---

[1] A notable exception is found in Luke 16:31 where most early authorities have the active verb and P75 and 579 give the passive.

[2] So, e.g., Sherman E. Johnson, "St. Matthew," p. 246.

The emphasis was upon the fact that God had raised Jesus from the dead, not that he "arose" by his own power. But this emphasis gradually shifted to the latter view and this change is reflected in certain passages in the New Testament, such as in the threefold announcement of the Passion in Mark and in a few Johannine passages. But what was begun in the writings of the New Testament was carried even further by some scribes who transmitted the text, probably because the use of the active suggested that Jesus was the divine Son of God before the Resurrection as well as afterwards; and, hence, he could "rise up" from the dead without aid by intervention from above.

Luke 24:3, 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52

There is a well-known series of seven variations in the text of Luke 24, all of which are identified by Westcott and Hort as "Western non-interpolations."[1] This description was given to certain noteworthy omissions in the Western text, which, with a single exception (Matt.27:49), are confined to the last three chapters of Luke. Westcott and Hort argued that these omissions, or non-interpolations, in the Western text have preserved the original form of the autograph of St. Luke.[2]

Many modern scholars have followed the lead of Westcott and Hort in omitting the following passages in Luke, chapter 24:[3]

vs. 3	" . . . of the Lord Jesus."
vs. 6	"He is not here, but has risen . . . ."
vs. 12	"But Peter rose and ran to the tomb; stooping and looking in, he saw the linen clothes

---

[1] See Hort, Introduction, Appendix, pp. 71-73.

[2] See ibid., pp. 175-177, for a discussion of this textual phenomenon.

[3] The translations in each case are from the RSV margin.

by themselves; and he went home wondering at what
had happened."
vs. 36 " . . . and said to them, 'Peace to you!'"
vs. 40 "And when he had said this, he showed them his hands
and his feet."
vs. 51 " . . . and was carried up into heaven."
vs. 52 " . . . worshiped him and . . . ."

Like others before them, the translators of the NEB did not regard these passages as part of the original text of Luke. It is reported that verses 6, 12, 36, and 40 were regarded by the translators as later insertions by assimilation to the text of either Matthew (in the case of vs. 6) or John (in the case of vss. 12, 36 and 40).[1] The variant in verse 51 was held to be a later insertion made probably when the Gospel was detached from Luke-Acts, while the one in verse 52 was considered simply a later addition.[2]

However, some scholars have not felt it possible to treat all of these variants as "neutral interpolations" (a more accurate term than Hort's "Western non-interpolations") or later additions to the text.[3] Hence, they have argued that one or more of these passages belong to the original autograph. Harnack, noting that Marcion omits the words "He is not here" in verse 6, suggested that he may have deleted these words because of a reluctance to admit that Christ was not everywhere.[4]

A.R.C. Leaney in his commentary on Luke expresses the view that verse

---

[1] Tasker, The Greek New Testament, p. 424.

[2] Ibid.

[3] See the criticism of Hort's proposal concerning "Western non-interpolations" in the text of Luke by Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 140-143. It has been observed that Codex D is no more infallible when it omits than when it inserts. See K. W. Clark, "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation," p. 10, who rejects the "non-interpolation" theory and thus favors the longer reading found in B and others at the end of Luke.

[4] See Blackman, Marcion, p. 138, who adds: "But this is not a necessary explanation of the absence of the words from so many manuscripts." Elsewhere Blackman lists this passage among those which may contain Marcionite tendentious alterations which have crept into the Old Latin tradition. (P. 157)

12 is possibly authentic, being omitted by D, the Old Latin (e a b l r), and Marcion.[1] He argues that the statement in verse 24 "refers to nothing in the previous narrative if we omit verse 12."[2] The fact that verse 24 refers to "some" who went to the tomb, whereas verse 12 mentions only Peter, might suggest that Luke had read the Fourth Gospel (cf. John 20:3-10), but "the natural explanation is that each was taking excerpts from a common source."[3]

If verse 12 is authentic, how shall we explain the omission of this passage by D, Old Latin manuscripts and Marcion? Harnack suggested that it was omitted as a tendentious alteration by Marcion because he did not like to believe that Peter was at the tomb, but E. C. Blackman thinks that Marcion possibly omitted it "because of the implication that clothes provided evidence of the Resurrection."[4] Thus Marcionite influence could account for the absence of this verse in the Western text, for it is known that Marcion did not believe in the resurrection of the flesh.[5]

Most commentators regard the variant at the end of verse 36, "and said to them, 'Peace to you!'" as an assimilation to John 20:19, 26. But its omission in D and the Old Latin (a b e ff^2 l r^1) could be explained by what follows in verse 37, which goes on to say that the disciples were "startled and frightened" by what they thought was a spirit.

Again, most scholars think that verse 40 is a later insertion from

---

[1] A.R.C. Leaney, _A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke_ ("Harper's New Testament Commentaries"; New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1958), pp. 28 f. Hereafter cited as Leaney, _St. Luke_.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 29.

[3] _Ibid_. See further arguments for such a source on pp. 29 f.

[4] Blackman, _Marcion_, p. 138.

[5] See Knox, _Marcion and the New Testament_, p. 7.

John 20:20, though with a slight change ("his feet" instead of "his side" as in John) in order to harmonize with verse 39. This verse is omitted in the Old Syriac (sin. and cur.) as well as Codex Bezae and the Old Latin (a b d e ff^2 l r^1). But its absence from these witnesses has been accounted for by both Harnack and Lagrange as another example of the influence of Marcion on non-Marcionite texts.[1] Marcion omitted this verse, as well as parts of verse 39, probably for dogmatic reasons, since this passage gives support to a view which Marcion rejected--the resurrection of the flesh. On the other hand, if we assume that D, the Old Latin, and the Old Syriac have preserved the original text at this point, the addition of verse 40 found in other ancient authorities has the effect of emphasizing the corporeal nature of the body of the Risen Lord. Such an emphasis would undoubtedly give offense to those who held a docetic view of Christ and would perhaps for that reason have been added to the text.

Luke 24:51

Since the variant in this verse deals with the Ascension, it deserves separate treatment from the "Western non-interpolations" in Luke, chapter 24, which have been discussed above. The omission of the words " . . . and was carried up into heaven" is attested in S D, the Old Latin (a b d e ff^2 j l), Syr. sin., and once out of three times by St. Augustine. Hort thought that the words were inserted in other texts at this point on the assumption that a separation from the disciples at the close of the Gospel must be the Ascension.[2]

---

[1] Blackman, Marcion, p. 157; see M. J. Lagrange's review of Harnack's Marcion (1st ed.) in Revue Biblique, XXX (1921), 611.

[2] Introduction, Appendix, p. 73.

If, as many scholars agree, the above witnesses have preserved the correct reading, then there is no reference at all to the Ascension as an event separate from the Resurrection in the original text of the Gospels, assuming that Mark 16:19, as part of the Longer Ending (16:9-20), is unauthentic. C.S.C. Williams thinks that we should expect some mention of it in one of the written Gospels on the ground that it formed part of the early proclamation of the Good News.[1] But the idea of the Resurrection and Ascension as separate, successive events was not expressed in the primitive kerygma. This distinct separation of the Resurrection and Ascension seems to have been devised by Luke, for the evidence found elsewhere in the New Testament points to the conclusion that they were originally considered simply as different aspects of the one truth that God had raised up Jesus and exalted him to the right hand of God (cf. Acts 2:32, 33).[2]

Streeter favors the longer reading in this passage, rejecting the suggestion by Hort and others that the longer text is the result of an attempt to assimilate the end of Luke to the account of the Ascension in Acts. He argues that the words, "and he was carried up into heaven," which imply that the Ascension took place on Easter Day instead of forty days later, were omitted to remove a chronological contradiction between the Gospel and Acts.[3] C.S.C. Williams, following Streeter's argument, suggests that the omission was made when the Gospel (Luke) or Gospels and Acts were first put into a codex.[4]

---

[1] Williams, Alterations, p. 51.

[2] See Barnabas Lindars, New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), p. 42, who adds in a footnote: "This is now an axiom of New Testament scholarship."

[3] Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 142 f.

[4] Williams, Alterations, pp. 52 f.

The present writer must here ask the question which was raised by a reviewer of Williams' book: "But may it not be that the making of a codex led an interpolator to add the ascension element to the gospel, thus rounding it off?"[1]

It is possible that some scribe inserted the longer reading in Luke 24:51 because he thought that either the Gospel of Luke or the Four-fold Gospel should include a reference to the Ascension as part of the Christian proclamation. The Longer Ending of Mark (16:9-20), which is almost certainly secondary, also contains a reference to the Ascension (vs. 19). Thus the desire to add such references to the Ascension at the end of the Gospel narratives concerning the Resurrection may account for the longer reading found in many early witnesses at this point in the Gospel of Luke.

If Luke himself had written these words at the end of his Gospel, we might expect him to have used a different verb in place of the one found in the longer reading, "was carried up." A.R.C. Leaney reminds us that at 9:51 Luke "uses the significant word 'assumption' to describe what the Lord was to accomplish in Jerusalem, including his death and entrance into glory; and by the use of the verb from the same root he links this with the actual Ascension which was the final means by which the Lord entered into his glory (Acts 1:2, 11, 22)."[2]

John 1:18

We have already noted elsewhere an important theological variant in the text of this verse, but there is another which must not be overlooked because of what it suggests concerning the work of Christ. It has not received the attention that it deserves, perhaps because few scholars think that it has little to commend it as the original reading. This variation is the omission of the words ὁ ὢν in Codex Sinaiticus, one Old Latin manuscript (a) and the Latin part of the bilingual Codex Sangallensis (ninth century).[1] The usual reading which includes these words is rendered, " . . . the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known." (RSV) But if we omit "who is" and translate εἰς in its most natural sense as "into," then it is possible to translate the second half of this verse as follows: "He (the only Son) leads (us) into the bosom of the Father." The Greek verb in this clause (ἐξηγήσατο) usually means "explain" or "interpret"; thus it resembles our word "exegete." But it also has the more literal meaning "lead," which according to Bauer's Lexicon (p. 275), is not found in the New Testament. We cannot assume that this meaning would have been impossible in the interpretation of this passage. Thus, some scribes apparently understood the second half of verse 18 in a different manner from the ordinary interpretation of these words. To them Christ was not merely the Interpreter or Revealer of God; he is the One who leads us into the very presence of God.[2] There are similar ideas expressed elsewhere in the Gospel of John. For example, in 14:2, 3 the author has Jesus tell his disciples that he is going before them to prepare a place for them so that "where I am you may be also."

---

[1] Sherman E. Johnson, "Review of Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts," JBL, LXXII (1953), 199 f. The NEB translators are said to have regarded this reference to the Ascension as "a later insertion made probably when the Gospel was detached from Luke-Acts." See Tasker, The Greek New Testament, p. 424.

[2] Leaney, St. Luke, pp. 295 f.

---

[1] See M.-E. Boismard, "'Dans le sein du Père' (Jo., I, 18)," Revue Biblique, LIX (1952), 23-29, who accepts the shorter text as the original.

[2] See the discussion of this variant in Porter, "Textual Analysis," pp. 192 f.

Christological Titles

The significance of Jesus for the early church can be seen from the numerous titles assigned to him as these are found in the New Testament. So great was the impact of his ministry, death, and resurrection that the early Christians did not hesitate to bestow upon him the highest honors, and one means of doing this was to refer to him by the use of one or more Christological titles. Thus he is called the Prophet, Son of God, Son of Man, Christ, Lord, Holy One of God, Servant of God, High Priest, Savior, and sometimes a combination of two or more, such as "Lord Jesus Christ."[1]

The scribes who transmitted the text of the New Testament were likewise conscious of the importance of the use of titles in referring to Jesus. Sometimes they substituted one or another of the titles listed above for the name "Jesus" which they found in the text. At other times they substituted one title for another. More often they simply added one or more titles to the name "Jesus." It would be beyond the scope of this investigation to recover all the variations in the text involving the use of Christological titles. Furthermore, it would be of little value to discuss each of them in the context where they are found. For this reason we shall treat only a few typical passages containing such variants; others will be listed according to the title or titles employed.

Matthew 1:18a

The Matthaean account of the birth of Jesus opens with an introductory statement to prepare the reader for what is to follow. "Now the birth of

---

[1] See Oscar Cullman, The Christology of the New Testament, who treats the total range of Christology in the New Testament by discussing the various titles as they are used in the New Testament writings.

Jesus Christ took place in this way." The author's use of "Christ" along with the name "Jesus" in this context seems to have lost much of its original significance as a title meaning "Messiah." This way of referring to Jesus by simply joining his name to the familiar title "Christ," as if the latter were part of his name, is found again and again throughout the New Testament. But there is an important variant reading in this passage involving the use of this title with its original meaning, "Messiah." Several witnesses, including one Greek minuscule (71), the Latin versions, the Old Syriac (sin. and cur.), and Irenaeus read "of the Christ" instead of the reading translated in the RSV, "of Jesus Christ." It is likely that "of Jesus Christ" is the earlier reading since a pointed reference to "the birth of the Messiah" could have been suggested by a previous reference to the Messiah in verse 17. Moreover, the omitting of the name "Jesus" in this passage would be more understandable than the adding of that name. Hence, we conclude that the text which omits the name "Jesus," thus making the sentence refer to "the birth of the Christ," is a secondary reading which exemplifies the tendency on the part of scribes to make full use of Christological titles in reference to Jesus.

Luke 2:11

This verse, containing three Christological titles, gives the angelic annunciation at Jesus' birth: "for to you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, who is Christ the Lord." (RSV) "Christ the Lord" is the reading found in most early witnesses, but it was evidently unsatisfactory to some scribes. Indeed there may have been an error at some stage in the transmission of this passage, and the original words were "the Lord's Christ" as in 2:26.[1]

---

[1] So Creed, St. Luke, p. 35.

This is precisely the reading found in one Old Latin manuscript (r^1), the Palestinian Syriac, and Ephraem. The NEB translators preferred the better-attested reading χριστὸς κύριος, translating it "the Messiah, the Lord," but they put the variant "the Lord's Christ" in a footnote, because some thought that it may have been the original.[1] The Washington Codex, Syr. sin. and pesh. change the word order and read "Lord Christ," but this is probably an attempt to avoid the more difficult reading χριστὸς κύριος. A literal translation of this phrase would be "anointed Lord," taking χριστὸς as an adjective, but in view of its well-established use as a title this is not the most probable meaning.[2] Leaney suggests that this phrase "with the two nominatives in such close juxtaposition occurred in a Greek-speaking environment, on the lips of those who were scarcely conscious that κύριος stood for the sacred name Yahweh."[3] It is true that "Christ the Lord" does not sound Jewish at all, and some translators and commentators have suggested that the Greek phrase be rendered "Christ (and) Lord."[4]

These variations in the text of Luke 2:11 raise the question of the proper titles to bestow upon Jesus. If the well-attested reading "Christ the Lord" is original, the variant found in W, Syr. sin. and pesh. may have been introduced at an early stage in the transmission of the text from a desire to assign to Jesus the proper messianic title.

Luke 9:20, 23:35

When Jesus asked his disciples the crucial question, "Who do you say that I am?" most early witnesses at Luke 9:20 give Peter's reply in these words: "The Christ of God." But Peter's response, according to some witnesses (D e), was "the Christ, Son of God." Some Old Latin manuscripts, Syr. cur., Justin, and Origen read, "You are the Christ," while the Coptic (not Sahidic) has "You are the Messiah God."

---

[1] Tasker, The Greek New Testament, pp. 418 f.

[2] Leaney, St. Luke, pp. 95 f.

[3] Ibid., p. 96.

[4] Creed, St. Luke, p. 35; cf. Goodspeed's translation--"Messiah and Lord."

While there are other readings in various witnesses to the text at this point, some of which are obviously drawn from parallel passages in Matthew and Mark, the above list is indicative of the great importance attached to the use of proper titles in reference to Jesus.

Again, in Luke 23:35 most witnesses report the scoffing words of the rulers concerning Jesus as he hung on the cross as follows: "He saved others; let him save himself, if he is the Christ of God, his Chosen One!" (RSV) But P75 fam. 13 and a few other manuscripts read: " . . . if he is the Christ, the Son of God, the Chosen One!" Another reading, found in Codex Bezae, represents the people rather than the rulers addressing these words to Jesus: "You saved others; save yourself, if you are the Son of God, if you are the Christ." In the second variant reading the word "Son" has been inserted in order to make the text read an additional title, "Son of God"; at the same time it alters a title that is unique in the Gospel of Luke, "the Christ of God," so that it becomes simply "the Christ." The third reading adds the phrase "Son of God" and omits the messianic title, "the Chosen One." These changes in the text may indicate a dissatisfaction with the messianic titles alone as descriptive of the person of Christ. Such changes as are indicated would be more acceptable to the predominantly Gentile churches of the second and third centuries when these textual variants likely arose.

John 6:69

The Johannine equivalent for the Synoptic account of the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi is found in John 6:68-69. Verse 69 in most ancient authorities reads: " and we have believed, and have come to know, that you are the Holy one of God." (RSV) "Holy One of God" is another messianic title, which is also used in the Synoptics (Mark 1:24, Luke 4:34).[1] It is almost certainly the correct reading in this verse, being attested in P75 S B and D. But there are several variations in the text which indicate the possibility that some scribes regarded the title "Holy One of God" inadequate as a designation of Christ. Tertullian preferred to read "the Christ," which is probably derived from Mark 8:29. Other witnesses (P66, some Sahidic codices and the Bohairic) give a combination of the two readings cited above, which comes out "the Christ, the Holy One of God." Still others (b, Syr. cur.) read "the Son of God," while "the Christ, the Son of God" is attested in several important manuscripts and versions (Koridethi fam. 1 33 a e, the Vulgate, and Syr. sin.). Finally, most Byzantine manuscripts have "the Christ, the Son of the living God," a reading which is derived from Matthew 16:16.

Such variation in the use of Christological titles in a single passage is ample evidence of the freedom with which the scribes handled the text where titles referring to Jesus were to be found, especially when these formed the substance of a confession attributed to the Apostle Peter.

Luke 7:39

The ordinary text of this verse makes the Pharisee who was host to Jesus at a dinner say concerning Jesus' willingness to allow a woman who was a sinner to wash his feet with her tears and wipe them with her hair: "If this man were a prophet, he would have known who and what sort of woman this is who is touching him, for she is a sinner." (RSV) The Pharisee has thus made a general observation: a prophet should be able to discern the character of a person who has sought him out and shown such obvious signs of love (vs. 47). That Luke wrote "a prophet" in this passage is attested by all textual witnesses except Codices Vaticanus, Zacynthius, and the original hand of one minuscule (482), which read "the Prophet." The latter reading was adopted by J. Weiss and was placed in brackets in the text of Westcott-Hort and Nestle. But the definite article is probably an interpolation, the intent of which was to make the passage refer to Jesus as a messianic figure as in Acts 3:22, John 1:21, and elsewhere (cf. Deut. 18:15).[1]

---

[1] Howard, "St. John," p. 576; cf. Barrett, St. John, p. 253.

This is one of several instances in which Codex Vaticanus gives what most scholars regard as a secondary reading and, in this case, one that assigns to Jesus a messianic title which is not suggested in the ordinary text.

John 7:52b

Most ancient testimony supports the ordinary text of this verse, the second half of which reads: "Search, and see that no prophet arises out of Galilee." However, Codices D W, some Old Latin manuscripts, and Copt. sah. read: "Search the Scriptures and see that no prophet arises out of Galilee." The NEB translators adopted this reading. But a more significant variant is found in P66, which adds the definite article before "prophet." The text of the last clause would then be translated, " . . . the Prophet does not arise out of Galilee." This is a singular reading in P66 and it may well represent the meaning which the author of the Fourth Gospel intended, for the argument ascribed to the Pharisees in the ordinary text of this verse--that no prophet arises out of Galilee--seems to be without parallel in Jewish literature.[1]

---

[1] So Creed, St. Luke, pp. 110 f.

"The Prophet" is a messianic figure in John (1:21, 25; 6:14; 7:40), and is to be distinguished from the term "a prophet" which is applied to Jesus in 4:19 and 9:17 by individuals who had not yet attained a mature faith.[2] Whereas in 1:21 and 7:40, 41 "the Prophet" seems to be distinguished from "the Christ," in 6:14 "the Prophet" is probably to be understood as a title of the Messiah, especially since here it is joined to the phrase "the Coming One" and is followed by the statement in verse 15 that Jesus perceived the intention of the crowd to make him king. Furthermore, the reading of P66 in 7:52 provides a parallel to the question asked in 7:41: "Is the Christ to come from Galilee?" (RSV) Thus this variant in the Bodmer papyrus offers additional evidence in favor of the identification of "the Prophet" and "the Christ" in the thought of the Evangelist. If P66 has preserved the correct reading in this passage, it affects not only the interpretation of this verse but also our understanding of the Evangelist's concept of "the Prophet" in relation to the Messiah. On the other hand, the scribe of P66 may have simply imposed his own view of what he thought the author of the Fourth Gospel intended to write at this point. In any case the addition of the article makes this passage refer to a messianic figure (the Prophet) rather than an ordinary prophet.

The debate which raged over the merits of the Western text as over against the Alexandrian or other texttypes a generation ago has not yet been settled to the satisfaction of all scholars.[1] Certainly the tendency among many scholars today is not to accept or reject the Western text as a whole but to judge each reading on its merits. Yet it is recognized by most textual critics of the present generation that the Western text of Acts is unique and that for the most part it represents an expansion and re-writing of the Alexandrian text.[2]

---

[1] Barrett, St. John, pp. 274 f., cites the following: "R. Eliezer (c. A.D. 90) said, "Thou hast no single tribe in Israel from which a prophet has not come forth" (Sukkah 27b); "Thou hast no town in the land of Israel in which there has not been a prophet" (Seder Olam R. 21)."

[2] J. R. Michaels, "Some Notable Readings of Papyrus Bodmer II," Bible Translator, VIII (1957), 153.

A tendency which some scholars have recognized in the Western text of Acts is the emphasis given to the figure of Christ. The simplest and clearest evidence of this tendency may be seen in the fact that Christological titles are frequently added to the name of Jesus and usually are brought to their fullest expression. As early as 1925 W. L. Knox cited several passages where "Christ" has been added to "Lord Jesus," or "Lord" is added to "Jesus Christ" or to "Jesus."[3] Afterwards, Lagrange noted several examples of "pietistic tendencies" in the Western text of Acts, among which he included a few passages where either "Christ" or "Lord" or both had been added.[4] Although he had little comment to make concerning the significance of such alterations in the Western text, P. H. Menoud noted that "these additions are commonly considered as devotional in character."[1] Of greater significance is his observation that these titles were most offensive to the Jews, who considered Jesus neither as Christ nor as Lord. Menoud failed to draw any conclusions from this; but more recently a young American scholar, Eldon J. Epp, who has made a thorough analysis of the Western text of Acts, gave a brief treatment of those passages in which the addition of titles is peculiar to the Western text and concluded that the addition of such titles is part of an emphasis on Christology which gives further evidence of an anti-Judaic tendency in the Western text.[2] Epp has provided a more complete list of those passages in which the D text of Acts is distinctive in giving a fuller expression of Christological titles than is found in the Alexandrian text, and he has rendered a valuable service by showing that these are not isolated instances with no apparent motive but rather part of a larger pattern of greater attention given to the person of Christ which provides another clue to the anti-Judaic tendencies in the Western text of Acts.[3]

---

[1] For a brief summary of the highlights of this debate see G. D. Kilpatrick, "Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts," JTS, XLIV (1943), 24 ff. A detailed account of the scholarly work devoted to the Western text may be found in A.F.J. Klijn, A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts (Utrecht: Drukkerij v.h. Kemink en Zoon N.V., 1949; idem, "A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts (1949-1959)," Novum Testamentum, III (1958-59), 1-27, 161-174.

[2] It is unnecessary to repeat the arguments here in favor of this view. The reader is referred to the standard works on the text of Acts, such as J. H. Ropes, The Text of Acts, pp. ccxv-ccxlix.

[3] See his "Introduction" to St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1925), p. xviii.

[4] See his Critique Textuelle, p. 390.

---

[1] P. H. Menoud, "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts," p. 31. Menoud cited the following passages where titles had been added: Acts 2:30; 4:33 (Christ); 2:38; 7:55; 17:4, 5 (Lord); 6:8; 14:10; 16:4 (both Lord and Christ).

[2] See Epp, "Theological Tendencies," pp. 81-85, who writes: "The portrayal of Jewish hostility toward Jesus and of Jewish responsibility for his death in the D-text reveal a clearly anti-Judaic attitude. The strong positive emphasis on Jesus as Lord and Christ, on the other hand, turns the sword in the wound, so to speak, for by presenting Jesus in bold and heightened tones the heinousness of the Jews' action against him is even more strongly emphasized." (Pp. 84 f.)

[3] Epp lists the following passages in which the D-text gives the fullest form of the name (or title), "the Lord Jesus Christ": 1:21, 2:38, 4:33, 5:42, 6:8, 8:16, 9:40, 10:48, 11:20, 13:33, 14:10, 15:11, 16:4, 16:31, 18:5, 18:8, 19:5, 20:21, 21:13. (Ibid., pp. 81f.) Of these, the following belong to larger Western variants only: 6:8, 9:30, 14:10, 16:4, 18:8.

Some manuscripts of the Western text of Acts carry the trend of giving the full title, "Lord Jesus Christ," even farther than the better known representatives of this recension. This is well illustrated by the recent publication of an English translation of Western readings found in an early Coptic manuscript containing the Book of Acts, chapters 1:1-15:2.[1] A study of the variants found in this manuscript from the fourth or fifth century reveals that it not only supports the reading of Codex Bezae and other representatives of the Western text at many places where the reading "Lord Jesus Christ" is given, but it also has this reading in three additional passages. In 8:35 Philip is reported to have "preached the Lord Jesus Christ" to the Ethiopian eunuch (a singular reading).[2] Again, in 9:20 this manuscript states that while Paul was in Damascus "he went in the synagogues of the Jews, he began to preach that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of God."[3] Similarly, in 9:17 the text of this manuscript describes Ananias' meeting with Saul: "And laying his hands upon Saul in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ he said to him . . . ."[4]

There are other Christological variants in the Western text which ought perhaps to be mentioned. J. H. Ropes called attention to the reading of Codex Bezae in two passages where it differs from all other witnesses. In Acts 20:21 the reading "faith through our Lord Jesus Christ" is substituted for "faith in our Lord Jesus," and in 16:15 "faithful to God" replaces "faithful to the Lord."[5] His comment on these variants in D is of interest: "These variants . . . suggest a desire on the part of the editor to indicate that the

---

[1] Theodore C. Peterson, "An Early Coptic Manuscript of Acts: An Unrevised Version of the Ancient So-called Western Text," CBQ, XXVI (1964), 225-241.

[2] Ibid., p. 235.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 237.

[5] Ropes, The Text of Acts, p. ccxxxiii.

'sebomenoi' won by the apostles were converted from the status of heathen to the true God through Christ, not merely from Jewish faith to Christianity.[1]

Again, the addition of "Christ" (D d et al.) after the name "Jesus" in 3:13 can be understood in the context as emphasizing the messiahship of Jesus (cf. vss. 18, 20).[2] In 8:37, where several Western authorities give various forms of the text (omitted in all the most important uncials), the confession--"I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God"--may be taken as emphasizing Jesus as Son of God. By the insertion of the name "Jesus" (D d Irenaeus) in 17:31 the Western text identifies Jesus in his future role as judge. Finally, in 28:31 some Western witnesses (p q w, Syr. hkl. et al.) conclude the Book of Acts with a creedal phrase, "that this is Jesus Christ the Son of God, through whom the whole world is about to be judged."[3]

These and other minor alterations found in the Western text of Acts in contexts involving the person of Christ may be taken as evidence that certain scribes had a deep interest in focusing greater attention on the person of Christ than is evident in the familiar Alexandrian text of Acts, which is generally followed by most English translators.

---

[1] Ropes, The Text of Acts, p. ccxxxiii.

[2] See the arguments in support of this view in Epp, "Theological Tendencies," pp. 71, 72, 83. I am indebted to this source (pp. 83 f.) at other points in this paragraph.

[3] Williams, Alterations, p. 56.

Chapter IV

VARIANTS BEARING ON THE LIFE OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

There are a great many textual variations in the New Testament which involve some aspect of the life of the Christian community. In order to include as many as possible within the scope of this investigation we have arranged them in several categories. The term doctrinal may not seem applicable to some of these, especially variant readings which touch upon the ethical and practical aspects of the Christian life. A more suitable term to use in connection with such alterations might be one that has been employed elsewhere in this study--"tendentious." Nevertheless, the treatment of such examples of textual alteration is perhaps justifiable in a study which seeks to provide a broad spectrum of theological conceptions reflected in the choice of variant readings in the text of the New Testament.

The Role of the Spirit in the Life of the Community

In the second chapter of this study attention has been given to certain textual variants which bear upon the Holy Spirit as one aspect of the doctrine of God. At this point a few variants will be considered which involve the role of the Spirit in the life of the church or of individual believers.

John 14:16-17

In John 14:16-17 the Fourth Evangelist reports Jesus as saying that the Father will send another counselor, the Spirit of truth, to be with his disciples forever. Speaking of the Spirit, Jesus said, " . . . you know him, for he dwells with you and will be in you." (RSV) The tense of the liquid verb μένει ("dwells") is in doubt since the original autograph probably lacked any accent which would indicate whether it is future (circumflex accent on the ultima) or present (acute accent on the penult). One Old Latin manuscript (g), the Vulgate, the Armenian and the Ethiopic versions have the future form of the verb, but most Greek manuscripts which employ accents and the earliest versions give the present tense. Editors of the Greek text have therefore adopted the present tense in this case. However, there is considerable doubt as to the correct tense of the next verb. Some important witnesses (P66 P75 S A D^2 L, most other Greek uncials and minuscules, the Vulgate, and the Coptic) read the future "will be" while others (B D* W fam. 1 69 565, the Old Latin, Syr. cur. and pesh.) have the present "is." Westcott-Hort adopted the latter reading but regarded the former as approximately of equal value. Tischendorf and Nestle preferred the future "will be," which was the choice of the RSV translators. But the NEB translators preferred the present "is" and placed the alternate reading in a footnote. If this was the original reading, then the variation in the text at this point could be accounted for by supposing that the verb "dwell" was construed as future and hence "is" was changed to "will be."[1] But it is equally possible that "will be" was the earlier reading, on the ground that John represents the giving of the Spirit to the disciples after Jesus was glorified (cf. 7:39, 20:22). The change from the future to the present would then have arisen out of a desire to refer to the indwelling Spirit as a present experience which the believer now enjoys. This tendency to alter the tense of verbs from the future to the present in order to make the passage more relevant to the reader's own situation can be seen elsewhere in the text of the Gospel of John.[1]

---

[1] See Tasker, The Greek New Testament, p. 428.

A feature of the Western text of Acts which some scholars have observed is the more frequent mention of the Spirit with a preference for the formal expression, "the Holy Spirit." Lagrange called attention to an emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit in the Western text of Acts, citing instances from 6:10; 8:18; 11:17; 15:29, 32; 9:1; 20:3.[2] J. Rendel Harris had earlier stated the view, based on his study of the D text, that this emphasis on the role of the Spirit was an indication of Montanist tendency.[3] But his view was later rejected by J. H. Ropes and others.[4] There are, nonetheless, certain variations in the text of Acts which are of significance because of their decided interest in the role of the Spirit in the life of the church.

In 6:10 Stephen's opponents were unable to "withstand the wisdom which was in him (D E h) and the Holy Spirit by which he spoke; for they were exposed by him with all boldness." (D E h t Syr. hkl. mg.)

More important is the addition in 8:39, which reports that the Holy Spirit fell upon the Ethiopian eunuch after his baptism by Philip. This reading has the support of Codex A and a few other Greek manuscripts, p w, Syr.

---

[1] See Porter, "Textual Analysis," pp. 187 f., who points to such alterations in John 1:4, 8:12, 14:17.

[2] See Lagrange, Critique Textuelle, pp. 390 f.; cf. Williams, Alterations, p. 56.

[3] See his Codex Bezae, pp. 148-153.

[4] The Text of Acts, p. ccxxxiv; Lagrange, Critique Textuelle, p. 393.

hkl., and Ephraem. A recently discovered Coptic manuscript of Acts also has this addition, but it is not found in Codex Bezae.

P. H. Menoud thinks it is possible that this Western reading is original and that it was omitted in the Alexandrian text because it contradicts the narrative in 8:14-17 which says that the Spirit came upon the believers in Samaria only after the laying on of the apostles' hands; furthermore, it does not follow "the general tendency of the Western recension to strengthen the authority of the apostles."[1] On the other hand, the longer reading in the Western text may represent a decided attempt to relate the gift of the Spirit to baptism as seen in Acts 2:38 (cf. 10:44-48 where baptism follows the gift of the Spirit).[2] Moreover, apart from this addition in the Western text there is no mention of the eunuch receiving the gift of the Spirit. A Western editor may have felt that such an oversight on the part of the author of Acts must be corrected.

At the end of Acts 11:17 the Western text makes a significant addition to the words of Peter addressed to the circumcision party in Jerusalem: " . . . who was I that I could withstand God _and not give the Holy Spirit to those who believed in him?_" (D 467 p w, Syr. hkl.) Here an editor of the D text apparently thought it proper that a convert should receive the Holy Spirit through an apostle.

In 15:29 at the close of the letter from the apostles and elders in Jerusalem to the Gentile brethren in Syria and Cilicia the Western text adds the phrase "being moved by the Holy Spirit" (D, Irenaeus, Tertullian) after the statement: "If you keep yourselves from these, you will do well." (RSV) Then in verse 32, where Judas and Silas are described as prophets, Codex Bezae adds the phrase "full of the Holy Spirit."

---

[1] Menoud, "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts," p. 30.

[2] The relation between baptism and the gift of the Spirit is not made clear in the testimony of Acts. Cf. 19:5, 6 where baptism is followed by the laying on of Paul's hands, at which time the Spirit came upon a group of disciples at Ephesus.

There are two instances where the Western text insists that Paul was directed by the Spirit against his own plans to follow a certain course. In 19:1 the D text reads: "When Paul, according to his own purpose, wanted to go to Jerusalem, the Spirit told him to return to Asia, and passing through the upper country he came to Ephesus." (P38 D, gig, Syr. hkl. mg., Ephraem) W. L. Knox makes the following comment on this reading in the Western text:

> Here we have an amazing insertion. . . . Apparently D, having inserted at xviii, 21 the statement (probably correct) that St. Paul wished to be in Jerusalem for a feast, and failing to see that the Church in v. 22 is that of Jerusalem and not the insignificant body at Caesarea has to explain why he never went to Jerusalem at all. Note the introduction of the Holy Ghost out of piety. Of course the alteration reduces the whole story to nonsense.[1]

Again, in 20:3 the Alexandrian text explains the change in Paul's travel plans by reference to the plot made against him by the Jews, but the Western text gives this reading in the second half of the verse: " . . . when a plot was made against him by the Jews, he wanted to set sail for Syria, but the Spirit told him to return through Macedonia."[2] Thus it is obvious from these examples that the Western text goes beyond the Alexandrian in its insistence upon the role of the Spirit in guiding and sustaining the apostles and other leaders in their task of carrying out the mission of the Christian community.

Variants Bearing on the Christian Life

There are several textual variations which involve some aspect of the

---

[1] Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. xx f.

[2] W. L. Knox says, "Here we have a good instance of D's lack of intelligence." (Ibid., p. xxv.)

Christian life. Such variations will reflect different points of view concerning the particular topic with which the passage in context is dealing.

John 20:31

A significant variation occurs in John 20:31, where the context (vss. 30-31) suggests that the author is stating the purpose of the gospel: " . . . but these [signs] are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name." (RSV) The word "believe" translates the present subjunctive πιστεύητε, the reading in Codices Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Koridethi, which is preferred by most modern editors of the Greek text. It may be translated "that you may continue to believe."[1] In the NEB this word is rendered, "that you may hold the faith," a translation which accentuates the meaning of this present subjunctive of the verb πιστεύω. However, all other early witnesses employ the aorist subjunctive πιστεύσητε, which could be rendered, "that you may here and now believe, that is, become Christians." This variant raises acutely the question of the purpose of the Gospel of John.[2] If the second reading is the correct one, then the Evangelist wrote in order to convert his readers; but if the first one is original, his purpose was to confirm the faithful. If we assume with most scholars that the present subjunctive was employed by the author of John, then the alternate reading could have arisen out of a recognition of the popular acceptance and use of this Gospel as a missionary tract by the end of the second century.[3] Thus the variation in the text of this verse raises the question not only of the purpose of the Gospel of John as conceived by the author but also the purpose of this document as conceived by later Christians who made use of it. Was it written to convince unbelievers or to deepen the faith of Christians?

---

[1] Barrett, St. John, p. 479.

[2] Ibid.

[3] The same textual variation occurs in 19:35 where the present subjunctive has the support of B S Koridethi, and Athous Laurae, while all other witnesses give the aorist subjunctive.

Luke 3:4

Quoting from Isaiah 40:3, the author of the Gospel of Luke writes: "The voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." (RSV) Most early witnesses support the reading "his paths," but there are at least three variants in the text at this point. The Septuagint of Isaiah 40:3 has "the paths of our God" and this is the reading found in the Latin translation of Irenaeus, who quotes from Luke 3:4. The Old Syriac and one Old Latin manuscript (r) give the reading in the last line of Luke's quotation as: "Make straight the paths for our God." Of greater interest to us is the Greek reading found in Codex Bezae, which has "Make your paths straight." This variant in D bears the marks of intentional alteration in a passage which was understood as an exhortation to prepare for the coming of the Lord, which for the Evangelist means Jesus Christ. Whereas "his paths" would refer to making straight the paths of the Lord, the reading in D would make this passage an exhortation to the readers to set their own lives in order, in preparation for the coming of the Lord. Hence, the variant in D may be taken as a tendentious attempt to make these words of the ancient prophet more relevant to the situation of the readers of the Gospel of Luke by construing them as a call to repentance and conversion.

Luke 10:41-42

The text of this passage raises the question of what is required of a devout person. In verse 41 Jesus reprimands Martha because she was anxious and troubled about her duties as a hostess while Jesus was a guest in her home. Then Jesus added: "One thing is needful." This reading is supported by P45 P75 C Koridethi fam. 13, the majority of Byzantine manuscripts, the Vulgate, and Syr. cur. and is translated in both the RSV as well as the NEB. Other witnesses read: "Few things are needful." (38 and Syr. pal.) Did some scribe understand Jesus' words here as a reference to food being prepared by Martha for her guest and thus write: "Few things are necessary"? This is a possible explanation for the origin of this reading. On the other hand, it could have arisen because Jesus was understood to be speaking of "spiritual" things and the first reading was considered an oversimplification of the requirements for salvation or the demands of the Christian life. Doubtless some early interpreters of this passage felt that more than one thing is needful if one is to give the proper expression of Christian love and devotion. Still another variant is attested in certain important witnesses which read: "Few things are needful, or only one." (B S L) Although this reading was adopted by Westcott-Hort and Nestle, it is considered by many scholars today as a very early conflation of the two readings given above, which, according to J. M. Creed, "does not appear to yield a tolerable sense."[1]

The problem raised by this passage may have been faced in another manner, by omitting the words of reproof addressed to Martha in verse 41 as well as the beginning clause in verse 42 (a b c e Syr. sin.). Codex Bezae omits most of this passage; thus it has, "Martha, Martha, you are troubled. Mary has chosen the good portion. . . ." This is hardly a word of reproof. At the same time it avoids the suggestion that one or few things are needful for those who would live a devout Christian life. The traditional interpretation of this well-known passage is clouded by the variety of textual forms found in our extant witnesses.

---

[1] See Creed, St. Luke, p. 154; Tasker, The Greek New Testament, p. 420.

John 14:21

The text of P75 contains an interesting variant in the second half of this verse which alters the interpretation of it. According to all other witnesses, Jesus said: " . . . and he who loves me will be loved by my Father, and I will love him and manifest myself to him." (RSV) But the text of P75 reads, " . . . and he who loves me will be kept by my Father . . . ." The origin of this reading is obscure and it is difficult to determine whether the scribe of P75, or an earlier one, intended it as a promise of the general protection of God, in a theological sense, or if it has reference to a particular historical situation. The Greek word τηρέω as used here probably means "to keep unharmed or undisturbed." A similar use of this word is found in John 17:11, where Jesus prays, "Holy Father, keep them in thy name. . . ." One of several themes that are interwoven in the discourses of this section of the Gospel of John (chapters 14-17) is that the disciples of Jesus will face tribulation and persecution (cf. 15:18-20; 16:32, 33). Thus the variant in the text of P75 at 14:21 is consistent with Johannine language and thought as represented in other passages; yet it would probably be incorrect to assume that this manuscript has preserved the original reading. It may have been introduced into the text in a period of local persecution and at a time when the idea of God's preserving those who love Christ seemed more appropriate.[1]

---

[1] I am indebted for this suggestion to Calvin L. Porter, "Textual Analysis," p. 205.

Romans 12:3

The ordinary text of the verse reads: "For by the grace given to me I bid every one among you not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think. . . ." (RSV) These words of Paul were directed to any Christians at Rome who thought too highly of themselves because of the special gifts which they possessed. "Such pride belongs to 'this age,' after which Christians must not fashion themselves (v.2)."[1] However, Paul's statement in this verse implies that one may have some regard for himself, "according to the measure of faith which God has assigned him." (Vs. 3b, RSV) But one should not think *more highly* of himself *than he ought to think*, for no one has anything that he has not received (I Cor. 4:7). Some manuscripts omit the words παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν (F^p G^p 70 1780, f g), perhaps by homoioteleuton. However, the possibility that this was an intentional alteration cannot be ruled out, for the change in the interpretation of this verse which is brought about by the omission would be understandable in certain contexts. The shorter reading would then be translated, " . . . I bid every one among you not to think highly of himself," or "not to be haughty." This interpretation would suggest that Christians are not to esteem themselves highly at all. The variant appeared in some manuscripts in the West as early as the ninth century, or perhaps earlier.[2] The effect of this omission is that it gives a more stringent interpretation of Paul's words in this passage, which suggests that the scribe responsible for this change may have had very strong convictions against any expression of pride or haughtiness.

---

[1] Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 235.

[2] F^p and G^p probably have a common archetype. Both are dated in the ninth century. See Metzger, *Text*, pp. 52 f.

I Corinthians 6:20

Most early witnesses support the text of this verse which is translated in the RSV: "You were bought with a price. So glorify God in your body." The context (vss. 12-20) makes it clear that Paul is urging a responsible use of the body, which is the gift of God and the temple of the Holy Spirit. Hence, it is natural that he should conclude his argument with an exhortation: "So glorify God in your body." But some scribes evidently regarded Paul's words as too abrupt, for most of the Byzantine manuscripts add: " . . . and in your spirit, both of which are God's." It has been suggested that the Byzantine scribes were unhappy with the shorter reading "probably not because of an ascetic suggestion but rather because of a sense of narrow materialism."[1] Chrysostom accepted the longer reading and gave the following explanation of Paul's injunction in the full text: "Now these things he says, that we may not only flee fornication in the body, but also in the spirit of our mind abstain from every wicked thought."[2]

Paul himself does not set the body over against the spirit in this passage. He had already stated that the bodies of Christians are members of Christ (vs. 15) and that whoever is united to the Lord is one with him in spirit (vs. 17). Therefore, he does not need to say more when he writes: "So glorify God in your body." But the Byzantine scribes wished to round out Paul's closing sentence on this subject and in so doing revealed their own concept of the body as more materialistic than Paul's view.

I Corinthians 13:3

There is a thorny problem in the text of this verse, of which the familiar reading is: "If I give away all I have, and if I deliver my body to be burned . . . ." (RSV) This reading has the support of Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Codices C D G L, the Latin versions, and the Syriac. It was adopted by Tischendorf and by Nestle and is translated in both the RSV and the NEB. However, some of the earliest and best witnesses support a different reading: " . . . if I give my body in order to *boast* . . . ." (P46 S B A 33 69) Lachmann adopted this reading, followed by Westcott and Hort, and it has since been the choice of E. J. Goodspeed, K. W. Clark, and others.[1] In favor of this reading it must be acknowledged that its external support generally outweighs that of the alternate reading; that it agrees with Pauline ideas found elsewhere (Rom. 3:5, Phil. 2:16) and with Paul's frequent use of the word meaning "to boast"; and that the traditional form of the text, which speaks of giving one's body to be burned, seems to fit the situation in the second century far better, when being burned alive was a more common form of martyrdom.[2] A majority of the NEB translators, however, preferred the traditional reading and supported their choice with logical arguments. Among these is the fact that it is favored by a strong consensus of commentators, both ancient and modern; that the reference to burning does not necessarily imply martyrdom at the stake, but may be a very strong expression for submission to the worst extremities; and that the phrase "in order to boast" disturbs the train of thought by introducing the idea of motive prematurely.[3] It might

---

[1] Clark, "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," p. 58.

[2] Ibid.

---

1. See Goodspeed, *Problems of New Testament Translation*, pp. 162-165; Clark, "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," pp. 61 f.

2. For additional arguments in support of καυχήσωμαι as the original reading see Goodspeed's discussion of this passage in *Problems of New Testament Translation*, pp. 162-165.

3. See Tasker, *The Greek New Testament*, p. 436.

also be argued that if the original text referred to giving one's body to be burned without the motive of love, some scribe would have substituted a word used frequently by Paul ("boast") because the earlier reading appeared to belittle the self-sacrifice of the martyrs of the church.

Whichever variant is accepted as the original will have a definite bearing on the interpretation of this passage. If the reading attested in P46 and the Alexandrian text is attributed to Paul, then he is saying, "If I dole out all my possessions and even give over my very self that I may boast, and have not love, I gain nothing." The image of self-sacrifice which is employed here is made clearer by a comment from Clement of Rome (I. 55): "Many gave themselves up to slavery, and receiving the price paid for themselves fed others."[1]

On the other hand, the traditional reading with its reference to burning strongly suggests the idea of martyrdom, or at least an intense form of suffering unto death. This reading introduces an idea which would be more meaningful to Christians living at a time later than Paul's day, when martyrdom was actually sought after by some Christians.

I John 2:20

Did the author of I John write in 2:20: "You all know" or "You know all things"? The first reading is found in several witnesses which are representative of the Alexandrian text (B S P Copt. sah.). Most modern editors of the Greek text, as well as numerous translators and commentators, have adopted this reading. The second variant is attested in Codices A C, the Latin Vulgate, Syr. hkl., Copt., boh., and most Byzantine manuscripts. It is probably a secondary reading which was introduced by one or more scribes who failed to understand the passage as directed against the claims of a few to possess esoteric knowledge. In response to such claims the author of I John insisted that "You all have knowledge." Here is a case of doctrinal alteration in reverse: a passage which originally contained a definite anti-Gnostic argument is altered in such a manner as to render it practically useless in the struggle with Gnosticism. Yet the change was made quite early, being attested in witnesses belonging to different textual traditions. Is it possible that someone sympathetic toward Gnostic ideas could have altered the text because he thought that "John" would not have written: "You all have knowledge"? Whatever explanation may be given for the origin of the second reading, it is certain that "You know all things" does not suit the context and that it misrepresents the thought of the writer of I John.

---

[1] Clark, "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," p. 62.

I John 4:7, 19

Love of the brethren is a favorite theme in the Johannine writings. Jesus' new commandment to his disciples is "that you love one another" (John 13:34, 35). The author of I John writes: "We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren." (3:14, RSV) Again, in 4:7 he writes: "Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God, and he who loves is born of God and knows God." (RSV) The clear implication of the last clause is that "he who loves (his brother) is born of God and knows God." But the text of Codex Alexandrinus reads: "He who loves God is born of God and knows God." This exegetical addition suggests that love for God identifies a person as a child of God. One could hardly take issue with this suggestion, but it is probably not what the author of John had in mind at this point. Rather, he is urging the love of the brethren, and here, as elsewhere, he declares that those who love one another are born of God. Although "John" enjoins his readers to love God, he warns them against the notion that it is possible to love God without loving one's brother (4:20). In any case God's love is prior to our love and his love enables us to love one another (4:10, 11, 19).

Again, in I John 4:19 there is a significant textual variation which raises the same issue, yet in this verse the addition has much better manuscript support. Here some witnesses read: "We love God because he first loved us" (S 13 33 34 69 91 137, the Clementine Vulgate, and Syr. pesh.), while most Byzantine manuscripts substitute "him" for "God." But other witnesses (A B 5 al.) support a reading which omits the word "God": "We love, because he first loved us." (RSV) This form of the text has been adopted by most modern editors of the Greek text as well as English translators and commentators. Despite the excellent support for the text which adds "God," the internal evidence favors the shorter reading, for here again the author of I John has in mind the love of the brethren. It is God's love for us in sending his Son to be the expiation for our sins that makes it possible for us to love one another (4:10, 11). Thus, the text which adds "God" and the one which adds "him" in this verse has the effect of changing the meaning of the Johannine teaching on Christian love by making it refer specifically to the love of God rather than the love of the brethren.

I Corinthians 8:3

The ordinary text of this verse reads: "But if one loves God, one is known by him." (RSV) But there are two significant textual variations which have a bearing on the interpretation of this verse. The Chester Beatty papyrus (P46) and Clement of Alexandria attest a reading which omits the name "God" and the phrase "by him." In addition, the phrase "by him" is omitted by the original hand of Codex Sinaiticus and in the text of an important minuscule (33). Most translators and commentators favor the longer reading; however, a majority of the NEB translators decided that the support of P46 and Clement was sufficient to balance the scales in favor of the shorter reading. Hence, they translated this verse: "But if a man loves, he is acknowledged by God."[1]

The shorter reading appears to suit the context as well as or better than the longer one, for Paul seems to be contrasting knowledge and love in relation to the Christian community. The knowledge of which some Corinthians were the proud possessors only contributed to the disintegration of the community, while love builds up that community by its consideration for the weak, "the brother for whom Christ died" (vs. 11).

On the other hand, the longer reading suggests that the love of God is of more importance than esoteric knowledge. Furthermore, the man who loves God is already known by God. Elsewhere Paul declares that to know God is to be known by him (Gal. 4:9). Thus it is not impossible that the longer reading represents what Paul wrote. However, the view that Paul has in mind the love of fellow Christians as the distinguishing mark of believers, as over against the claim to special knowledge, seems more in keeping with the context.

Acts 15:20, 29

Perhaps the best known example of textual variation bearing upon the life of the Christian community is found in the passage from Acts 15 concerning the apostolic decree promulgated at the meeting of the apostles and elders at

---

[1] Apparently, the translators added the phrase "by God" without intending it as a paraphrase of the longer reading "by him," for they give as an alternate translation in a footnote the words "he is recognized."

Jerusalem. The Alexandrian text in verse 20 reads: " . . . but should write to them to abstain from the pollutions of idols and from unchastity and from what is strangled and from blood." (RSV) In 15:29 we find that the substance of the decree is the same in the Alexandrian text but the terms appear in a different order and with slightly different words. However, there are some interesting omissions and additions in certain witnesses which indicate that these passages were handled with considerable freedom by those who transmitted the text. Thus P45 omits the phrase "and from unchastity" in verse 20; the same phrase is absent from Origen in verse 29. (The latter verse has not been preserved in P45.) The phrase "and from what is strangled" is not found in either verse in several Western witnesses (D d gig, Irenaeus). It is also absent from verse 29 alone in others (Tertullian, Cyprian and Ambrosiaster). Finally, a negative form of the Golden Rule is added in both verses in Codex Bezae, Irenaeus, and certain other Western witnesses.

These variations raise the question whether the original form of the decree was of a ceremonial character as suggested by the Alexandrian text and the text of P45, or constituted a moral code as suggested by those authorities which omit the reference to "what is strangled" and add the negative form of the Golden Rule. There has been considerable debate as to which form of the text represents the original, and as to the reasons for the existing variations attested in the witnesses. The arguments favoring the different views are too detailed to be dealt with here. A few summary statements will set forth the alternative positions.

The Alexandrian text supports the idea that the decree provided for the proper ritual requirements concerning "clean" and "unclean" practices to be observed by Gentiles who wished to have table-fellowship with Jewish Christians. Some Western authorities, which omit the reference to "what is strangled" and add the negative form of the Golden Rule, give a definite moral interpretation to the decree if we understand "the pollution of idols" as idolatry and "blood" as a reference to abortion, child-exposure and murder generally. The text of P45, supported by Origen, the Ethiopic version, and one Vulgate manuscript, may represent a compromise between the Alexandrian and the Western texts or it may represent the original from which these two have diverged. If the latter be true, then the decree was possibly aimed at providing a simple food law forbidding meats offered to idols, things strangled and (the drinking of) blood. The reference to fornication was later added because of the need for such a moral prohibition against sexual irregularities. In this view both the Western and Alexandrian texts were affected by an early attempt to add a moral interpretation to the original form.[1]

According to one view, the primitive text of the decree included only two prohibitions, abstinence from food offered to idols and from blood, the others having been added in different localities to meet the needs of the growing church.[2] Since the text of P45 includes only three terms, all of which are concerned with unclean foods, it is very near to the original.[3] The text of Tertullian, which adds a reference to fornication, is a step further away from the original, for it introduces a new regulation affecting a matter which had apparently not been under discussion at the Jerusalem conference.[4] Of far greater importance is the addition of the Golden Rule in the D text. Concerning this variant P. H. Menoud writes:

---

[1] I am indebted in this paragraph to the discussion of Acts 15:20, 29 by Williams, Alterations, pp. 72-75.

[2] See the discussion of Acts 15:20, 29 by P. H. Menoud, "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts," pp. 22-28.

[3] Ibid., p. 24.

[4] Ibid.

> It stresses the moral obligation and, above all, it makes out of a regulation governed by a time-given situation a timeless principle of Christian conduct. What is now imposed on all Christians by apostolic authority is . . . essentially the new principle of Christian thought and life, practicable only by those who have the guidance of the Spirit.[1]

It should be noted that there is wide agreement among scholars today that the Alexandrian text of Acts 15:20, 29 is probably earlier than the D text. Against the priority of the Western text we agree with those who think it unlikely that the Jerusalem council would have found it necessary "to impress upon Gentile Christians, as the condition of free social intercourse with Jewish Christians, the abstention from such obvious sins against Christian morality as idolatry, unchastity, and murder, or from the more blatant forms of heathen worship."[2] That some moral restrictions were later needed to correct abuses in the church may be seen from the reference to immoral practices in Revelation 2:20 f., which may reflect a knowledge of the decree in an early form.[3]

Variants Bearing on Common Practices of the Christian Community

The fact that the early Christian community was constantly exposed to a variety of influences, both Jewish and non-Jewish on the development of certain Christian practices seems to have left some traces on the text of the New Testament. Even a conservative critic such as B. B. Warfield has acknowledged that in a few instances a reference to fasting has been added in passages which mention prayer.[1] Attention will be given to these and other passages where textual variants reflect the special interests of certain groups or individual leaders in the early church.

---

[1] Menoud, "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts," p. 27. Note the addition of the words "being led by the Holy Spirit" in the D text of Acts 15:29.

[2] G.H.C. Macgregor, "The Acts of the Apostles," p. 204.

[3] If, as many critics think, the Alexandrian text is closer to the original form of the text in these passages (Acts 15:20, 29), then the account in Acts may well have been influenced by the "Noachian" laws (usually listed as seven in number) which Jews in the first century regarded as binding on all mankind. See George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era (3 vols.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927), I, 274 f., 453. The decree in Acts 15:20, 29 would be one version of the minimal requirements for Gentiles if they were to remain in God's good favor. The "Western" variants would then represent an attempt on the part of scribes to give a moral interpretation to the decree.

Mark 9:29; Acts 10:30; I Corinthians 7:5

Most manuscripts, including some which represent an early form of the text (A D W Koridethi fam. 1 fam. 13 565 700, the Old Latin [except k], and Syr. sin.), add the words "and fasting" at the end of Mark 9:29, but a few important witnesses (S* B k, the Georgian version and Clement of Alexandria) attest a reading which omits these words. The latter is translated in the RSV: "And he said to them, 'This kind cannot be driven out by anything but prayer.'" Most other modern English translators and editors of the Greek text have also adopted the shorter reading. R.V.G. Tasker states that the NEB translators regarded the words "and fasting" as "a later pietistic addition."[2]

On the other hand, Paul-Lewis Couchoud thinks that the lacuna in P45 at this point indicates that the longer reading was once attested in this manuscript and has been suppressed by a corrector who saw a contradiction with the words of Jesus on fasting in Mark 2:19.[3] He regards the longer reading as representing the original text, on the ground that fasting was at times employed in addition to prayer as a means of casting out certain kinds of demons.[1]

---

[1] A. T. Robertson, Introduction, p. 158, cited three passages (Mark 9:29, Acts 10:30, I Cor. 7:5) which Warfield regarded as examples of "doctrinal correction." Cf. Warfield, Introduction, p. 96.

[2] The Greek New Testament, p. 415.

[3] See his "Notes sur le Text de St. Marc dans le Codex Chester Beatty," JTS, XXXV (1934), 3-22, esp. 19.

In view of the increasing emphasis on ascetic practices in the early church and the corresponding insistence upon fasting as an obligation laid on all Christians, especially in connection with prayer, the longer reading may well be an adaptation of the text in this passage, as in others, toward the growing emphasis on fasting among certain groups of Christians. Some later scribes also added the words attributed to Jesus in Mark 9:29 (plus "and fasting") at the close of the parallel account of the epileptic son in Matthew (17:21).

In Acts 10:30 there is a significant variant in the Western text in which fasting is again connected with prayer. Most early witnesses read: "And Cornelius said, 'Four days ago, about this hour, I was keeping the ninth hour of prayer in my house. . . .'" (RSV) Codex Bezae has "three days" instead of four and with other Western authorities adds "fasting" before the reference to the ninth hour so that the Western text reads: "I was fasting and praying at the ninth hour." (D gig Syr. hkl.) A similar reading is found also in P50 E and most Byzantine manuscripts, which also connect fasting with prayer. The consensus of most scholars is that this addition is secondary and that it can be explained as an indication of the importance attached to fasting and prayer as expressions of the religiously disciplined life. Of course, there are references to "fasting and prayer" elsewhere in Acts. In 13:3 fasting and prayer preceded the ceremony that launched the mission of Barnabas and Saul. Here Codex Bezae inserts the word "all" in order to emphasize the point that "all" were fasting and praying. Again, in 14:23 the selection of elders in the churches of Asia Minor was made with prayer and fasting.

---

[1] Couchoud, "Notes sur le Text de St. Marc," p. 19.

In I Corinthians 7:5 Paul's counsel to husbands and wives concerning conjugal rights and obligations includes the following advice: "Do not refuse one another except perhaps by agreement for a season, that you may devote yourselves to prayer. . . ." (RSV) This reading is supported by almost all early textual witnesses. Yet the Byzantine text and the Syriac version refer to "fasting and prayer," which, like the variants discussed above, is indicative of the increasing emphasis on fasting as an obligation laid upon all Christians. The Didache (8) gives certain instructions on both fasting and prayer. Similarly Hermas feasted and prayed before receiving his visions (Vis. II, 2.1 and III, 1.1).[1] We conclude that such references to a combination of prayer and fasting in works dating from an early period provides additional evidence of the importance attached to these practices as a means to spiritual enlightenment.

Luke 4:2

The second half of this verse reads in most witnesses: "And he ate nothing in those days; and when they were ended, he was hungry." (RSV) In certain manuscripts (fam. 13 69 122 124 346 al.) the words "nor did he drink" are inserted after the words "he ate nothing." We have already noted in Chapter III that this addition heightens the miraculous element in the narrative at this point; and, in so doing, it emphasizes the complete mastery of Jesus over his physical needs. Here a further comment may be added to the effect that this variant reading appears to reflect the more stringent attitude of later Christians toward the requirements of fasting. To suggest that Jesus ate and drank nothing for forty days would not inspire many today to follow his example, but this form of the text might well have been prompted by a desire to make Jesus the example of complete abstinence from both food and drink during long periods of fasting observed by Christians who led an ascetic life.

---

[1] See Clark, "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," p. 59.

Mark 13:33

This verse contains an exhortation which introduces the ensuing parable in verse 35. Most witnesses read: "Take heed, be on the alert and pray." However, some important manuscripts (B D 122 a c k) support a form of the text which omits the words "and pray." The latter is preferred by most modern translators and commentators. The words "be alert and pray" are reminiscent of Mark 14:38 and may have been suggested by the words of Jesus to his disciples in that context; but an exhortation to pray does not seem to fit the context in Mark 13:33, which introduces the parable of the Absent Householder. In this parable and its accompanying application in verses 34-36 the emphasis is upon vigilance or keeping awake and alert in anticipation of the return of the master of the house. The addition of the words "and pray" in certain early witnesses in verse 33 indicates the importance attached to prayer as a duty incumbent upon those who wait for the coming of the Lord. The believer must not only "keep awake" or "be alert" but give himself to prayer as well so that he may not be unprepared when his Lord comes.

Matthew 22:4; Luke 2:36; John 2:3

J. Rendel Harris as early as 1908 called attention to the possible influence of Tatianic or Encratite views on the Old Syriac manuscript which was discovered by Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis in the monastery of St. Catharine on Mount Sinai in 1892 (Syr. sin.). This manuscript attests a singular reading in Matthew 22:4, where the king's invitation to the marriage feast of his son reads simply: "Behold, everything is ready; come to the marriage feast." This shorter form of the text omits these words: "I have prepared my feast; my oxen and fat cattle have been slaughtered and . . . ." Thus there is no mention of meat on the menu of the king's banquet. Harris thinks that this shorter reading in Syriac Sinaiticus is to be explained as evidence of Tatianic or Encratite influence on the text of this manuscript.[1] He cites as a further example the reduction of the married life of Anna the prophetess from seven years to seven days in Luke 2:36, where the word "days" is substituted for "years" in the text of Syriac Sinaiticus and Ephraem the Syrian. It is generally known that Tatian was an Encratite and so probably looked on marriage with disfavor. C.S.C. Williams suggests that he was capable of introducing this change in the text of Luke 2:36, since he disliked marriage.[2] Harris also noted that "Tatian along with many early believers was sorely puzzled by the presence of locusts in the diet of that very holy man, John the Baptist"; hence, he removed the reference to locusts and gave John a diet of "milk and honey" in place of the conventional menu.[3] In a later reference to these changes Harris commented, "Certainly we were on the way to a vegetarian and a celibate New Testament."[4]

Another example of a possible Encratite modification is found in St. John's account of the marriage at Cana attended by Jesus and his disciples.

---

1. See Harris, Sidelights, pp. 31 f.; idem, "Was the Diatessaron Anti-Judaic?" p. 105.

2. See Williams, Alterations, p. 28; cf. D. Plooij, "Eine enkratitische Glosse im Diatessaron," ZNW, XXII (1923), 1-16; idem, Tendentieuse Varianten, pp. 18 f.

3. Harris, Sidelights, p. 32.

4. "Was the Diatessaron Anti-Judaic?" p. 105.

The depletion of wine at the marriage appears to be ascribed to the fact that the guests had drunk freely of what was provided (cf. vs. 10). But some Old Latin manuscripts offer another explanation for the failure of the wine mentioned in John 2:3. These witnesses insert the words per multam turbam vocitorum (e l) or propter turbam vocitorum (sic) before the statement that the wine supply was depleted; thus the wine was consumed because of a great crowd of guests. This would mean that those present would not have had an excessive amount to drink. Such a reading suggests the possibility of Encratite influence on the text at this point.[1]

Romans 14:17

Paul is concerned in this section of his letter to the Romans with the responsible use of Christian freedom. As in I Corinthians, chapter eight, he counsels his readers to consider the welfare of a Christian brother rather than insist upon the right to eat or drink what one likes. "For the kingdom of God does not mean food and drink but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." (Vs. 17, RSV) There is a significant variant in the text of this verse which is indicative of the special interest of those who believed that a devout and holy life must be characterized by the discipline of ascetic practices. The scribe of Codex 4 inserted the words "and asceticism" after "righteousness," thus attaching equal importance to the demands of self-discipline as to those qualities which might be described as the fruit of the Spirit--righteousness, joy and peace. If the kingdom of God is not "food and drink," it is, among other things, living according to an ascetic ideal. So the scribe of Codex 4, or an earlier one, must have reasoned. This variant is a good illustration of the axiom that the text of a given time and place may reflect the particular theological interests of the age and locale that produced it.

---

[1] "Was the Diatessaron Anti-Judaic?" p. 105. Harris, commenting on a suggestion by H. J. Vogels that this is an Encratite modification, says, " . . . it certainly looks as if he had given the right explanation."

I Corinthians 7:28

In I Corinthians, chapter seven, Paul states his opinion that the married and the unmarried should remain as they are (vs. 27). Yet to those who cannot accept this advice he adds: "But if you marry, you do not sin, and if a girl marries she does not sin." (Vs. 28a, RSV) The scribe of Codex 1780 (the Duke New Testament) followed this form of the text; however, a corrector of this manuscript erased the words "But if you marry, you do not sin," thus leaving a space in the manuscript at this point.[1] He was evidently offended by the suggestion of Paul that those who marry do not sin. The most probable explanation is that these words do not lend support to the rule of celibacy which many religious persons had accepted as binding upon those who had taken the monastic vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. The erasure of this clause by a corrector of Codex 1780 therefore belongs in the category of variants which bear upon certain ideals and practices of the Christian community.

Variants Bearing on the Ritual and Liturgy of the Church

Church historians and New Testament scholars have long since recognized that the primitive church began with little attention being given to the forms to be used in worship; nor was there any clearly defined doctrine of the sacraments in this early period. Yet as the Christian movement began to include larger numbers of converts among the Gentiles and as the needs of the church became more complex, some attention to these matters was required. In the New Testament itself there are several examples drawn from what must have been a great variety of materials such as hymns, prayers, and the like which were used in the worship-life of the early church.

---

[1] See Louis F. Gough, "The Text of the Earlier Pauline Epistles in the Duke New Testament," pp. 19 f.

We shall consider here a few textual variants which are related to certain aspects of the ritual and liturgy of the church.

Mark 7:4

Mark gives a parenthetical statement in 7:3-4 concerning the Jewish observance of "the tradition of the elders" as it relates to ceremonial washings. Verse 4a reads in some important manuscripts: " . . . and when they come from the market place, they do not eat unless they purify themselves. . . ." (RSV) The word "purify" translates the Greek ῥαντίσωνται, which in the active form means "sprinkle" but here seems to mean "to ritually cleanse" or "to purify." According to Tischendorf this reading is attested in B S 40 53 71 86 237 240 244 259 and others. Yet Tischendorf adopted an alternate reading--βαπτίσωνται--which is found in A D Koridethi and a great number of other witnesses, including the Byzantine text. Since this word can mean "to wash" (under water) when used in the sense of ritual washings, it is quite possible that this is the original reading even though it was rejected by Westcott-Hort and Nestle. More recently, the NEB translators have adopted it and have translated it "washing." Among others, G. D. Kilpatrick thinks that this reading is earlier and that it was replaced in some early witnesses by the alternate term meaning "cleanse" or "purify" because the word βαπτίζειν had become in Christian circles an exclusively theological term with special reference to baptism.[1]

E. J. Goodspeed follows the suggestion that the verb in this case refers not to the persons themselves but to the food which they obtain from the market place. Thus he translates: " . . . and they will not eat anything from the market without first purifying it by sprinkling it. . . ." If this is an accurate rendering of the Greek and if we assume that Westcott-Hort's text at this point represents the original, then the theological significance of textual variation in this instance becomes obscured. Since either word mentioned above could have been used in the sense required by the context, we cannot be certain that this alteration in Mark 7:4 is theologically motivated, but the possibility that theological factors were involved in the origin of a divergent reading here cannot be ruled out, for βαπτίσωνται seems to be used in the New Testament in a non-theological sense only here and in Luke 11:38.[2] It is therefore unlikely that a later scribe would have substituted this term here for one which meant "to purify" or "cleanse."

John 3:5, 8

According to the textual apparatus in the twenty-fifth edition of Nestle there is a significant variation in the text of John 3:5, where one manuscript of the Vulgate (Harleianus), along with Justin and sometimes Origen, omits the words "water and," so that these witnesses attest the words of Jesus, " . . . unless one is born of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God." This passage was used widely in the early centuries of the church as a basis of dominical authority for the sacrament of baptism. It is cited by several early fathers in its longer form, and frequently with additions drawn from liturgical sources, with a definite application to the rite of baptism.

---

[1] See Kilpatrick, "Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts," p. 32.

[2] *Ibid.*

Kirsopp Lake in his inaugural address at the University of Leiden in 1904 dealt at length with the question of the original text in this passage.[1] He argued cogently, although from silence, that Justin Martyr's text of the New Testament did not contain any reference to "water" in John 3:5 or to the trinitarian baptismal formula in Matthew 28:19. In this connection he also noted that Hilary, supported by the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions, as well as Codex Sinaiticus, quotes verse 8 with the insertion of the words "of water and" before "of the Spirit" so that these witnesses read: " . . . so it is with everyone who is born of water and of the Spirit." (Vs. 8) Textually this is very strong evidence for the longer reading in verse 8, but there is general agreement among scholars that the words "of water and" are a later interpolation. Lake concludes:

> There could hardly be better proof that early writers were capable of inserting a reference to water where none was to be found in the original text, if they thought that they could improve it by so doing, and it is evidence for an early perception of the fact that verses 5 and 8 ought textually to correspond.[2]

According to F. C. Burkitt, the text of Syriac Sinaiticus in verse 5 reads: "from spirit and water," thus inverting the terms found in the Greek. There are also slight variations in verse 8, where Syr. sin. has "from water and spirit" and Syr. cur. has "from water and from spirit." "These variations in rendering," says Burkitt, "and the transposition of 'spirit' and 'water' by S in v. 5, may be explained if we suppose that the original form of the *Ev. da-Mepharreshe* (or the Greek text underlying it) omitted the mention of 'water' in each case." The reference to water, he infers, was thus a later insertion in verses 5 and 8.[1]

---

[1] See The Influence of Textual Criticism, pp. 13-21.

[2] Ibid., p. 18.

If the original text included the words "water and" in verse 5, then the author probably intended it as a symbolic reference to baptism, possibly John's baptism (cf. 1:33) or, more likely, Christian baptism, with "the Spirit" representing Pentecost.[2] Christian baptism is often (though not always) represented in the New Testament as the means by which the Spirit is conferred.[3]

Although the evidence for the omission of "water and" in verse 5 is not altogether convincing,[4] it should be acknowledged that the omission of these words, when taken together with the shorter text of Matthew 28:19 as quoted by Eusebius at least 25 times, raises the question of a Scriptural basis of dominical authority for the sacrament of baptism.[5]

John 13:10

There are two major forms of textual tradition represented in this verse. The best known text reads: "He who has bathed does not need to wash, except for his feet. . . ." (RSV) But a shorter reading is attested in some witnesses: "He who has bathed does not need to wash." The former has the support of most manuscripts, including (P66) B W (D Koridethi), the Byzantine text, and some Old Latin and Vulgate manuscripts.[1] The latter is supported by Codex Sinaiticus, some Old Latin (c z) and Vulgate manuscripts, Tertullian, and Origen. This reading was favored by a majority of the NEB translators, who thought it possible that the words "except for his feet" were inserted by a scribe

---

[1] See Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, pp. 309 f.

[2] See W. F. Howard, "St. John," pp. 439, 505.

[3] Barrett, *St. John*, p. 174.

[4] Both P66 and P75 (c. A.D. 200) have the words.

[5] Rudolf Bultmann argues on subjective grounds that the words "water and" in John 3:5, as also John 6:51b-58, are later insertions to an ecclesiastical redaction of the Gospel. See his *Das Evangelium des Johannes* ("Meyer's Kommentar"; 13th ed.; Gottingen: Vandenhoed and Ruprecht, 1953), p. 98.

> who failed to understand the spiritual significance of what Jesus was saying and supposed that he was merely drawing attention to the social custom by which the guest who arrived at a banquet after having bathed at home needed to have only his feet washed on arrival at his host's house. Or the shorter text may have been understood to imply that the "washed" or "baptized" need no further forgiveness.[2]

Both readings in this verse are very early and it is difficult to choose between them because the meaning of the passage is obscure and scholars differ greatly in their interpretation of it. It is interesting to note that Tertullian appropriated this passage from John in his _De Baptismo_ where he writes: "_Qui semel lavit, non habet necesse rursum._" Although it is unlikely that Tertullian is responsible for the shorter text, he appealed to the latter in his insistence upon a single performance of the baptismal rite. His use of this passage in a discussion of baptism reveals that in some quarters at the beginning of the third century it was understood to refer to the Christian initiatory rite and the sufficiency of a unique participation in that rite for

---

[1] Codices Bezae and Koridethi read: "He who has bathed does not need to wash his head, but only his feet." P66 reads: "He who has bathed does not need to wash, except for his feet only."

[2] Tasker, _The Greek New Testament_, p. 427.

"the washing of regeneration." The addition of the phrase "except for his feet" suggests that the regenerate man (whose rebirth has been symbolized by baptism) needs only to be cleansed from the small, everyday stains of this earthly life.[1] Early Christian views on baptism are evidently reflected in both the longer and shorter readings in this verse. Thus, it is not necessary to decide which reading is to be given priority in order to see that a difference of interpretation on the meaning of baptism may be involved in the choice of variant readings in this verse.

Matthew 28:19

The text of this verse as found in all manuscripts and versions reads: "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." (RSV) This use of the triune formula in connection with the command to baptize has been regarded in some quarters as suspect on the ground that the primitive church, as suggested by the Book of Acts, baptized new converts in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38, 10:48) or in the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts 8:16, 19:5). According to a Western reading in Acts 8:37, a new convert before being baptized would simply confess that the Son of God is Jesus.

In a discussion of this passage in Chapter II it was pointed out that Eusebius employed a shorter form of the text of Matthew 28:19 at least 25 times. He omitted the words "baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," and used "in my name" in place of the threefold formula. F. C. Conybeare was the first to raise the question as to

---

1. Howard, "St. John," p. 683.

whether or not Eusebius has preserved the original form of the text in this verse.[1] In 1904 Kirsopp Lake again raised this issue in his inaugural address before the University of Leiden.[2] Commenting on the findings of Conybeare, Lake writes:

> Moreover, as Mr. Conybeare has shown good reason for thinking that Aphraates of Nisibus and Justin Martyr were ignorant of the usual reading, he has made out an excellent case for thinking that the words in Mt. 28:19, Baptizing . . . Holy Ghost, are an interpolation in the text of the Gospel, which, he suggests, was perhaps made in Africa.[3]

W. F. Howard expressed the opinion that Eusebius, though he may have been aware of the longer reading in this passage, quoted the shorter form because it was doubtless the more familiar one.[4] But others have suggested that Eusebius used a kind of shorthand expression to convey the sense of the longer formula, or that he was pledged to silence regarding the mysteries of the Christian faith (*disciplina arcani*).[5] Moreover, it has been pointed out that Justin was not ignorant of the longer form, for in his account of Christian baptism in his First Apology (LXI) he gives an expanded treatment of the threefold formula.[6] F. C. Burkitt finds evidence in Ephraem's Commentary on the Diatessaron that the longer text of Matthew 28:19 was attested in the Diatessaron and that the evidence of the Syriac *Theophania* seems to indicate that the ordinary text was also generally current in the Old Syriac tradition.[7]

---

[1] See Conybeare, "Doctrinal Modifications," pp. 102-108.

[2] See Lake, *The Influence of Textual Criticism*, pp. 8 f.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[4] See Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine," pp. 10 f.

[5] Williams, *Alterations*, p. 34.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

[7] *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, pp. 171, 279.

The longer baptismal formula is likewise found in the Didache (VII, 1) which is sometimes dated in the early second century.

The fact that so much evidence supports the longer text in Matthew 28:19 has led most scholars to conclude that despite the early use of a baptismal formula which lacks the reference to the Trinity, the longer text may be said to represent the original text of this verse. It is possible that the usual reading here gives evidence of an early development of a threefold formula of baptism which must have originated in those centers like Antioch where the majority of new converts were Gentiles, who were instructed in the doctrine of God as Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier before they were baptized in the name of the Triune God.[1]

However, the shorter text as attested by Eusebius must have been known and used in some quarters as late as the first quarter of the fourth century; otherwise it is difficult to explain why so learned a man as Eusebius would have so often cited it in this form, thus omitting the command to baptize.

Acts 8:37

"And Philip said, 'If you believe with all your heart, you may.' And he replied, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.'" (RSV mg.) This verse is omitted in modern translations of the New Testament or else relegated to the margin as a secondary reading, as in the RSV and NEB. It is found in E 103 104 429, the Old Latin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, and Augustine and is regarded by most textual scholars as a Western addition. Hort designated it as a "noteworthy rejected reading." It passed into the early Greek printed editions through Erasmus, who found it in the margin of one of the manuscripts (4) used by him and inserted it in his text "as having been omitted by the carelessness of scribes."[1] From his editions it passed into the Received Text, though it is not found in the earlier Byzantine text.[2]

---

[1] Williams, Alterations, p. 36.

It seems clear that this passage was added to the original text of Acts because of the widespread use in the second century of a confession of faith before baptism. Such a confession may have been regarded by some scribes as a prerequisite for baptism. Without it Philip's act of baptizing the Ethiopian eunuch would have appeared strange and inexplicable to later minds. To the eunuch's question in verse 36: "What is to prevent my being baptized?" an answer is supplied which makes it possible for the eunuch to give a verbal confession of faith as the basic requirement for Christian baptism.[3]

I Corinthians 11:29

Paul's account of the Lord's Supper in I Corinthians is the earliest such account in the New Testament. Because of certain abuses, particularly the divisive effect of the Corinthian observance of what must have been a common meal or love feast, Paul felt constrained to issue a warning against the offenders: "For any one who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment upon himself." (Vs. 29, RSV) Many witnesses, however, insert the word "unworthily," thus making the text read: "For any one who eats and drinks unworthily . . . ." This addition is attested in D G and other Western manuscripts, the Byzantine text, the Latin versions, and the Syriac Peshitta but is absent from P46, and the Alexandrian Uncials. It appears to have been inserted at this point under the influence of 11:27. But in 11:29 there is no need to introduce another condition by the insertion of the word "unworthily," for Paul's warning in the latter verse already has a modifying phrase, "without discerning the body," which states the condition under which an offender will bring judgment upon himself. To insert "unworthily" in the text at this point obscures the original condition, thus weakening the force of Paul's warning against the failure to "discern the body." This is especially the case as the text is translated in the Authorized Version.[1]

---

[1] Hort, Introduction, Appendix, p. 93.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Cf. an earlier form of confession in Romans 10:9: " . . . if you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved." (RSV)

It might be observed that many of the same witnesses which add "unworthily" in verse 29 also add the phrase "of the Lord" after "body" as an attempt to indicate whose body is implied. However, this addition does not clarify the issue as to what Paul had in mind. Was he thinking of the mystical body of Christ, the church? Many commentators think so, but others hold that the word "body," like the words "body and blood" in verse 27, bears a close relation to the bread and the cup mentioned several times in verses 23-32. In this view verse 29 is a parallel to verse 27 and "the body" refers to the sacred reality which is represented in the bread and the cup. The addition of the phrase "of the Lord" would seem to support this view; but if this is an interpretative addition, as most critics would agree, then it is still possible that Paul had in mind the body of Christ, i.e., the church, the nature of which he discusses at length in chapter twelve.

Luke 22:19b-20

This passage is probably the best known example of Westcott and Hort's

---

[1] See Clark, "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," pp. 60 f.

"Western non-interpolations" found in the last three chapters of Luke. There are many variations and rearrangements in the text of Luke 22:17-20, but we shall concern ourselves mainly with the problem of the "longer" or "shorter" reading in verses 19-20. Codex Bezae and some Old Latin manuscripts (a ff^2 i l) omit the words "which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me. And likewise the cup after supper, saying, 'This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood.'" (RSV mg.) Two other manuscripts (b and e) also omit these lines and put verse 19a before verses 17-18, so that the bread comes before the cup, as in other accounts of the Lord's Supper.

It is generally known that Westcott and Hort defended the shorter text in this passage. They suggest that the longer text may have been derived from the parallel account in I Corinthians 11:24-25 and that the double reference to the cup (i.e., cup-loaf-cup) makes the longer text appear even more suspect.[1] The wording is very similar in these two passages, so that Luke 22:19b-20 may have been taken from Paul's account or, as Burkitt suggests, from a liturgical text itself based on St. Paul.[2]

Thus, many critics and commentators agree that the text of D and other witnesses represents the original text of Luke in this passage.[3] Various reasons are given for the addition of verses 19b-20 by a later scribe or editor. Kirsopp Lake pointed out that without this addition there is no word in the Gospels which supports the dominical institution of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. There was a tendency, he adds, to make such additions in the text as a means of giving dominical authority to the sacraments.[4] E. C. Blackman cites

---

1. See Hort, Introduction, Appendix, pp. 63 f.
2. Burkitt, Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, p. 300.
3. See, e.g., Creed, St. Luke, pp. 263 f.; Leaney, St. Luke, pp. 72-75.
4. See Lake, The Influence of Textual Criticism, pp. 8 f.

the suggestion by W. Bauer that Luke 22:19b-20 is an addition of Marcion's, who derived it from I Corinthians, chapter eleven, "because he needed some authority for the continued observance of the Eucharist by his own adherents."[1] A.R.C. Leaney thinks that the shorter text is authentic and that the longer text was added by a later copyist, who preferred a full account of the Last Supper to the concern of Luke for preserving the secrecy of the actual Christian rite.[2] Among other modern translations, both the RSV and the NEB have the shorter reading in the text with the longer reading in the margin.[3]

In recent decades, however, some critics have supported the view that the longer reading is original. A. T. Robertson expressed doubts concerning Hort's arguments in favor of the shorter text, and concluded his remarks on this passage by stating: "The balance of evidence is slightly in favor of the genuineness of this passage, though it is by no means certain."[4] Two British scholars, F. G. Kenyon and S.C.E. Legg, after a careful study of the textual data, wrote: "Our conclusion is that the longer version of Luke is to be preferred; but that in any case the words of Luke are derived from Paul and Mark. . . ."[5] On the continent other scholars, including J. Jeremias, have come out in support of the longer text. Jeremias himself in his first edition of Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu took the view that the shorter text is original,

---

1. See Blackman, Marcion, p. 157.
2. St. Luke, p. 73.

3. According to R.V.G. Tasker, the NEB translators discussed the textual problem in this passage at great length, and he has provided an excellent summary of the arguments for each of the two major texts. See Tasker, The Greek New Testament, pp. 422 f.

4. Studies in the Text of the NT, p. 86.

5. "The Textual Data," The Ministry and the Sacraments. Edited by R. Dunkerley (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1937), pp. 271-286, esp. p. 286.

but reversed his opinion in the second edition.[1] In support of the longer text he acknowledges that 22:19b-20 is non-Lukan in idiom and was therefore taken over by Luke as a liturgical formula known to him and inserted into his Gospel when he came to the words of institution. This would explain the similarity between Luke and Paul (I Cor. 11:24-25) without assuming that Luke must have known I Corinthians if he wrote verses 19b-20.[2] The shorter version arose somewhere in the West as an attempt to keep the Eucharist from profanation.[3] This would explain the abrupt ending of the account at "this is my body," which is attested in several Western authorities. It also indicates how different versions of the shorter text could have originated, as in the Old Latin b and e and in the Old Syriac tradition.[4] Another consideration is that "the numerous and widely divergent transpositions in MSS and versions may all be readily understood as 'more or less clumsy surgery' designed to force Luke's account into the proper liturgical pattern; this presupposes the 'longer' text."[5] We have already noted that the motive of the transposition in b and e which put verse 19a before verses 17 and 18 is that the bread may come before the cup. It is also possible that Syriac Curetonian, which has all of

---

1. See J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans. by A. Ehrhardt (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 87-106. Jeremias gives a list of twenty-two continental scholars who favor the longer text. (P. 106, n. 1.)

2. Ibid., pp. 102 f. A.R.C. Leaney thinks that Jeremias' argument here is strange. He holds that Luke himself ended his account with deliberate abruptness in order to preserve the secrecy of the rite. See his St. Luke, pp. 73 f.

3. Ibid., pp. 103-106.

4. For additional arguments in favor of the longer text see P. Benoit, "Le récit de la Cène dans Lc. XXII, 15-20; Étude de critique textuelle et littéraire," Revue Biblique, XLVIII (1939), 362-393.

5. Tasker, The Greek New Testament, p. 423.

verse 19 (omitting "given") before verses 17 and 18, has been altered from the same motive.[1]

Thus it appears that scholars are very much divided on the issue of which text, the longer or shorter, is original in this passage.[2] Realizing the complexity of the issue and the difficulty of determining which form of the text explains the origin of the others, this writer suggests that the ambiguity of the textual tradition in this passage reflects the concern of the early church for the proper order and/or completeness of the account of the Last Supper, which lies behind the church's observance of the Eucharist.

Luke 11:2

There are several textual variations in the Lukan and Matthaean versions of the Lord's Prayer, some of which arose out of a desire to harmonize the two versions, while others arose as a means of adapting to the liturgical needs of the churches the prayer which Jesus had taught. Our primary concern here is not with the original form of the prayer as given by Jesus but with the text of the prayer as found in the Gospels.

Perhaps the most significant textual variation in the Lukan version is in the second petition at 11:2, where most early witnesses read: "Thy kingdom come." A significant alternative form of the text is the reading, "Thy Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us," which is attested by (162) 700, Marcion, Gregory of Nyssa, and Maximus of Turin. The more familiar reading is found in all of the earliest Greek codices, including P75.

Most critics accept the better-attested reading as original and regard the one which contains a petition for the Holy Spirit as a Marcionite alteration or as "a liturgical adaptation of the original form of the Lord's Prayer used perhaps when celebrating the rite of baptism or of the laying-on of hands."[1]

---

[1] Williams, Alterations, p. 50.

[2] K. W. Clark prefers the longer reading which is now attested in P75. See "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation," p. 10.

Another view is expressed by G.W.H. Lampe, who thinks it is possible that this reading is not the work of Marcion himself but is original in Luke. He writes: "It would certainly be in harmony with Luke's conception of the Spirit as the primary object of prayer."[2] That this variant fits well with the Lukan reading "Holy Spirit" in 11:13 where Matthew has "good things" (cf. Matt. 7:11) has often been observed. B. H. Streeter, along with Harnack and others, was inclined to regard the petition for the Holy Spirit as original in Luke.[3] However, its suitability could well have motivated its later formulation. Perhaps the strongest argument in favor of this reading is the fact that it differs from the parallel petition as recorded in Matthew; and in view of the tendency to assimilate the two versions, we might expect that the petition in Luke would be brought into harmony with Matthew's version, as later scribes were inclined to do elsewhere in the Lord's Prayer. On the other hand, if Luke wrote "Thy Holy Spirit come upon and cleanse us," it is difficult to see why such an edifying petition would ever have been dropped.[4]

---

1. For the latter view see B. M. Metzger, "Lord's Prayer, The (Text of)," _Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge_, edited by L. A. Loetscher (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1955), II, 673. F. C. Burkitt suggests that the variant originated in the liturgical usage of the Marcionites. See his "Review of _The Four Gospels_ by B. H. Streeter," _JTS_, XXVI (1924-25), 290.

2. G.W.H. Lampe, "Holy Spirit," _The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible_, edited by G. A. Buttrick, _et al._ (4 vols.; New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), II, 633.

3. See Streeter, _The Four Gospels_, p. 277.

4. See F. C . Burkitt, "Review of _The Four Gospels_ by B. H. Streeter," p.

While it is quite possible that Luke may have simply appropriated a form of the Lord's Prayer which was used in contemporary liturgy in connection with baptism and the Lord's Supper, it is not so certain that the form he used contained the reading which was known to Gregory of Nyssa and others.[1]

While there may be some doubt as to the true text of Luke 11:2, there is considerable agreement among textual critics that the doxology at the end of Matthew 6:13 is a later addition which was made in order to adapt the Matthaean version of the Lord's Prayer for liturgical use. This addition of the doxology is found in W Koridethi fam. 13 28, most Byzantine manuscripts, and (with varying omissions) in the Old Latin, the Syriac versions, Copt. sah. and the Didache. In the Didache, for example, it is added to the prayer in the short form: "Thine is the power and the glory." (8:5) Here it may have been said by the people as a response. The doxology is omitted *in toto* in several representatives of the earliest textual traditions (S B D fam. 1, the Latin Vulgate, Copt. boh.) and is therefore regarded as a liturgical addition designed to make the Lord's Prayer a more complete act of worship.

Variants Bearing on the Church's Relation to the Jews

It is a well-known fact that several of the writings included in the New Testament reflect the concern of the early church over relations with the

---

289, who wrote: "But my chief objection to the genuineness of the clause about the Holy Spirit is its extreme correctness and orthodoxy."

[1] But see the discussion of the Lukan text of the Lord's Prayer by A.R.C. Leaney, *St. Luke*, pp. 59-68, who thinks that the reading known to Gregory at Luke 11:2 may be authentic and is possibly derived from Jesus himself.

Jews. Since the primitive church was a movement within Judaism, this conflict between Christians and Jews was at first confined largely to disciplinary actions of the synagogue or the Great Sanhedrin in Jerusalem. The Book of Acts provides the most obvious examples of hostility between Christians and Jews, which eventually led to the separation of the church and synagogue, but this conflict is often reflected in the Gospels and other literature of the New Testament.

Matthew 1:21; Luke 2:10

There are likewise numerous variations in the text of the New Testament which indicate the attitude of some scribes and editors of the text toward the Jews. Some of these variations reflect a universalistic outlook which tends to set Christianity over against a more exclusivistic attitude so often identified with Judaism in the early Christian centuries. One such variation is found in Matthew 1:21, where the usual text reads: " . . . for he will save his people from their sins." However, Syr. cur. has a slight, but important, change: " . . . for he will save the world from their sins." Leon Vaganay cites this as an example of tendentious alterations and suggests that the scribe of Syr. cur. found the Jewish touch in this passage too strong for him.[1] In this connection it has also been noted that in Luke 2:10 all the Syriac versions alter the angelic annunciation, from "great joy which shall be to all the people" (i.e., all the people of Israel) to "great joy which shall be to all the world."[1] The two readings involve a difference of only one letter in Syriac and it is possible to explain the Syriac reading as an unintentional error, but it is a more plausible suggestion that the double change represents a deliberate modification from a pro-Judaic statement to a universal one.[2]

---

[1] Vaganay, Introduction, p. 63; cf. Harris, "Was the Diatessaron Anti-Judaic?" p. 107, who cites this passage along with others suggested by Vogels as examples of anti-Judaic influence on the text of the New Testament. Cf. H. J. Vogels, Handbuch der Neutestamentlichen Textkritik (Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923), p. 178.

Whether or not such variations in the Syriac text are to be explained as deliberate modifications may be debatable, but there is considerable evidence that the Western text of Acts has traces of a more universalistic attitude than is indicated by the Alexandrian text. The quotation from Joel as given in Acts 2:17 contains some interesting variations in Codex Bezae, which gives the plural in place of the singular of "all flesh" in verse 17 while "your" is changed to "their" in two instances and is omitted altogether in the other two. These changes in the quotation from prophecy emphasize the universal purpose of God for all mankind in distinction from Israel.[3] They also set the Christians over against the Jews, as is the case in the text of an early Coptic manuscript representing the Western text at Acts 3:22, which reads: "I will raise up to _them_ a prophet (om. "from among your brethren, as he raised up me") _like you_."[4] The writer of the D text apparently did not want to apply the promise of the gift of the Spirit to the Jews, to whom Peter was speaking, but to Christians as the true heirs of God's promises. Therefore, in Acts 2:39

---

[1] Harris, "Was the Diatessaron Anti-Judaic?" p. 106.

[2] _Ibid_. This argument is attributed to Vogels, who assigns this variant to the hand of Tatian.

[3] See Ropes, _The Text of Acts_, p. ccxxxiii. P. H. Menoud, "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts," p. 29, cites Acts 2:17, 2:47, and 4:31 as instances where the D text expresses a more universal attitude than the B text. Cf. Lagrange, _Critique Textuelle_, pp. 392 f.

[4] Peterson, "An Early Coptic Manuscript of Acts," pp. 231 f.

where the Alexandrian text reads: "For the promise is to you and to your children" D and Augustine have "to us and to our children." Again, in Acts 2:47 D has "world" in place of "people" in the description of the Christian community at Jerusalem, "praising God and having favor with all the world." Because of the similarity of these two words in both Syriac and Aramaic, one could explain the two readings here as an unintentional error by supposing that D was a retranslation into Greek from a Syriac text containing this error or by postulating an Aramaic original in this part of Acts (C. C. Torrey) from which both readings were derived.[1] Still, the possibility must be allowed that an editor of the D text of Acts has emended the text in order to convey the impression that the early church enjoyed a wide acclaim beyond Jerusalem. Finally, in 4:31 where most witnesses read: " . . . and spoke the word with boldness," the Western text (D E Irenaeus) adds: "to everyone willing to believe." This addition emphasizes the universal nature of the proclamation made by the apostles (cf. Rom. 1:16).[2]

Along with this emphasis on universalism there is a strong anti-Judaic tendency in the Western text of Acts. This tendency is revealed, for example, in the fact that the D text emphasizes the full responsibility of the Jews for the death of Jesus, whereas the Alexandrian text appears to allow the Jews a possible excuse on the basis of ignorance: "I know that you acted in ignorance" (3:17). Here the scribe of D does not suppress the reference to the ignorance on the part of those who killed Jesus, but he neutralizes its meaning by the addition of πονηρόν . What the Jews did was nonetheless an "evil thing."[1] In this connection the D text likewise makes clear the Jews' responsibility for the persecution directed against the apostles and the church.[2]

---

[1] See Williams, *Alterations*, p. 57.

[2] For additional variants on the universalism in the D text of Acts see Epp, "Theological Tendencies," pp. 88-108.

On the other hand, the D text emphasizes the powerlessness of the Jews in their attempts to restrain the activities of the apostles and the church. To the words "you will not be able to overthrow them" in 5:39 are added: "neither you nor your rulers" (E gig) or "neither you nor kings nor tyrants." (D h Syr. hkl.) Again, in 4:14 where most witnesses report that the Jews "had nothing to say in opposition," the D text reads: "They had nothing to do or say in opposition." (D h)[3] According to the Western text, Stephen's opponents "could not withstand the wisdom that was in him and the Holy Spirit by which he spoke, because they were refuted by him with all boldness. When they could not gainsay the truth . . . ." (Acts 6:10-11) This reading tends to heighten the opposition between the leaders of the church and the Jews and to emphasize the triumph of the former over the latter.

This matter of the church's relation to Jews and their religion comes to light also in the textual variations found elsewhere in the New Testament, especially in the text of Luke and in the letters of Paul. The following examples are representative of a larger number of such variations, several of which have a Marcionite character.

---

[1] Menoud, "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts," p. 28; cf. Epp, "Theological Tendency," pp. 66-77, who finds evidence in 3:17, 13:27, and 17:30 that the textual variants of D emphasize the Jews' greater responsibility and their more direct and hostile action in the condemnation and death of Jesus; *idem*, "The 'Ignorance Motif' in Acts and Anti-Judaic Tendencies in Codex Bezae," *HTR*, LV (1962), 51-62. Cf. Luke 23:41, where the D text gives the words of the penitent thief concerning Jesus' innocence: " . . . but this man has done nothing evil (πονηρόν)."

[2] *Ibid*. Menoud cites as examples: Acts 4:9, 13:45, 14:2-7, 18:12-13.

[3] *Ibid*.

Luke 5:39

The best-attested text of this verse reads: "And no one after drinking old wine desires new; for he says, 'the old is good.'" (RSV) However, the entire verse is omitted in D a b c d e ff l, Irenaeus and Eusebius. Westcott and Hort placed it in brackets to indicate some doubt as to its authenticity. It is found in P75 and all of the great uncials except D but was apparently absent from other Greek manuscripts as well since Marcion, Irenaeus, and Eusebius do not support the text which includes it. Harnack thinks that its omission in the Western text is due to the influence of Marcion's text.[1] Marcion himself may have deliberately omitted it, for he "would have disliked such a reference to the superiority of presumably Jewish or pre-Christian customs or habits."[2] If it was not in the text of Luke known to Marcion, it could have been omitted by some scribe or editor who feared lest the verse might be interpreted allegorically to mean that the law and the prophets were to be preferred above the message of Christ or that the Old Covenant was regarded as more satisfying than the New.

Since the saying in this verse is not found in Mark and is omitted here in D and the Old Latin, J. M. Creed suggests that it may not be original in Luke.[3] Whether it was interpolated at this point by the Evangelist or by an early copyist, the saying expresses "the attitude of one who is traditionalist in religion toward the innovations of a new movement. . . ."[4] It would seem that the inclusion of this verse in the text gives support to a point of view which is not represented in the text that omits it. That the saying in this verse could have been interpreted as favoring the Jews' religion seems likely. Hence, its omission in certain witnesses, including Marcion, might well be explained as an indication of an anti-Judaic attitude on the part of an early editor of the Western text.

---

[1] Harnack, Marcion, p. 247*.

[2] Williams, Alterations, p. 13; cf. Blackman, Marcion, p. 135, who writes: "It is probable that Marcion would have found the verse intolerable had he known it. But in view of its absence from so many Old Latin authorities and D, it is equally probable that Marcion was not acquainted with it at all."

[3] Creed, St. Luke, p. 83.

[4] Ibid., pp. 83 f.

Luke 9:54, 55-56

Here James and John asked Jesus if they should "bid fire come down from heaven and consume them [the Samaritans] as Elijah did." There is agreement among many scholars that the words "as Elijah did" have been added by a later scribe at the end of Luke 9:54. Of greater importance is the longer text found in Luke 9:55-56. The best-attested reading in this passage is: "But he turned and rebuked them. And they went on to another village." (RSV) But some witnesses insert all or part of the following after "them": "and he said, 'You do not know what manner of spirit you are of; for the Son of man came not to destroy men's lives but to save them.'" (RSV mg.) This longer reading is attested in D Koridethi fam. 1 fam. 13, most Byzantine manuscripts, the Latin versions, Syr. cur., and Marcion. It is absent from P45 P75 S A B W 28, 1, and Syr. sin.

J. Rendel Harris suggested that these additions in 9:54-56 are probably Marcionite and that the meaning of the latter passage (vss. 55-56) is that the disciples were acting as though they belonged to the just god rather than to the good God.[1] With this judgment Harnack was in agreement.[2] On the other hand, Zahn could not accept the suggestion that the shorter form of the text was original, for this would imply that one of Marcion's most antinomian readings found its way into a large number of Catholic manuscripts.[1] He held that Catholic writers objected to verses 54b and 55b on account of the use made of them by the Marcionites and the apparently Marcionite character of their contents; hence, the longer form was written by Luke and not invented by Marcion.[2]

---

[1] Harris, Codex Bezae, pp. 232 f.

[2] See his Marcion, p. 185*.

More recently, the NEB translators omitted the longer form of the text in verses 55-56 "as a later insertion due perhaps to the influence of Marcion." The Marcionite character of this form of the text is generally acknowledged. The words which are peculiar to the longer text in 9:54-56 constitute the rebuke of an attitude which was identified in Marcion's mind with the Jews and their Creator god. The disciples, James and John, were betraying their own Jewish inclinations when they suggested that fire be called down from heaven upon the Samaritan village. Such an attitude contradicts the spirit of the good God whom Christ revealed. Thus the longer text in this passage bears the marks of a Marcionite emendation.

Luke 23:2

Among the accusations brought against Jesus before Pilate, Luke gives the following statement attributed to the Jewish leaders: "We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding us to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ a king." (RSV) However, several Old Latin manuscripts (b c e ff i l q r^2) and Marcion insert these words after "our nation": "and abolishing the law and the prophets" or "and abolishing our law and the prophets." (b) This variant in the Old Latin text bears all the marks of a

---

[1] Nestle, Introduction, pp. 272 f.

[2] Ibid.

Marcionite addition, for it attributes to Jesus precisely what Marcion believed that the revelation in Christ had in fact accomplished.[1] The same charge of "doing away with the law and the prophets" was alleged against Marcion by the "orthodox."

The Gospel of Matthew ascribes to Jesus the words: "Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfill them." (5:17, RSV) These words may or may not have been spoken by Jesus, but they may well express Jesus' purpose.[2] This saying, however, runs counter to Marcion's conception of Jesus' relation to the law and the prophets. According to Marcion, Jesus had not come to fulfill them but to displace them entirely.[3] But according to the Old Latin and Marcion at Luke 23:2, it looks as if Jesus has been identified with those whose hostility toward the Jews includes a total rejection of the law and the prophets. Thus, the anti-Judaic attitude in this variant is clearly evident.

Luke 23:34a

This well-known verse in Luke reads as follows: "And Jesus said, 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.'" (RSV) These words are omitted in several important witnesses including P75 B D* W Koridethi, a d, Syr. sin., and Copt. sah. This passage was regarded by Westcott and Hort as a "Western interpolation," which was later adopted in eclectic texts and then was received into general currency. It is attested in S* A C D^c L N fam. 1 fam. 13 565 700, most Byzantine manuscripts, the Latin versions, Syr. cur., Marcion and Origen. Many scholars follow the suggestion of Westcott and Hort that this utterance from the cross was introduced into the text from some extraneous source.[1] Yet despite the excellent support in favor of its omission from the text of Luke, few editors of the Greek text and translators have dared to omit this prayer of Jesus from the cross. The NEB translators are said to have regarded the evidence as too finely balanced to justify its excision from the text.[2]

---

[1] See Blackman, Marcion, p. 140, who thinks that the Old Latin tradition at this point has been influenced by Marcion's text; cf. Harris, Codex Bezae, p. 230; Harnack, Marcion, p. 247*.

[2] See Sherman E. Johnson, "St. Matthew," p. 291.

[3] See Knox, Marcion and the New Testament, p. 7.

Westcott and Hort rejected the view which assumes that these words stood in the text of Luke and were deliberately removed.[3] J. Rendel Harris, however, found sufficient evidence in the New Testament and other early Christian literature to convince him of the existence of an early and violent anti-Judaic polemic which could account for the excision of these words from the text of early witnesses at Luke 23:34.[4] Streeter restates the suggestion by Harris that these words might have been deleted by some Christian of the second century who found it hard to believe that God could or ought to have forgiven the Jews.[5] He speaks with favor of this suggestion and adds that the claim of these words to be an authentic part of the Third Gospel deserves serious consideration.[1] Leaney agrees with the view that Luke may have written these words and says their omission in certain manuscripts "may be due to the conviction, common in Gentile Christian circles, that God did not forgive the Jews for the crucifixion, but punished them for it by the destruction of Jerusalem."[2]

---

[1] Hort, Introduction, Appendix, p. 68.

[2] See Tasker, The Greek New Testament, p. 424.

[3] They wrote: "Wilful excision, on account of the love and forgiveness shown to the Lord's own murderers, is absolutely incredible: no various reading in the New Testament gives evidence of having arisen from any such cause." See Hort, Introduction, Appendix, p. 68.

[4] Harris, "New Points of View," pp. 324-334; idem, "Was the Diatessaron Anti-Judaic?" p. 106.

[5] See Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 138, who writes: "One might add, it would have appeared to a second-century Christian that, as a matter of fact, God had not forgiven the Jews."

It should be noted that although the author of Acts held the Jews responsible for the death of Christ, they are, nevertheless, said to have "acted in ignorance" (3:17). This statement may be held to support the text which includes the prayer of Jesus on the cross. If this was the earliest form of the text of Luke, then the omission of the prayer in some early witnesses may be attributed to an anti-Judaic bias in early Gentile Christian circles.

Romans: 1:16

Was the good news of salvation given first to the Jews and afterward to the Greeks? Was this the divine order for the proclamation of the gospel? Apparently some early Christians did not think so. Among them was Marcion, who is usually credited with having omitted the word πρῶτον in Romans 1:16, which implies that the gospel was offered first to the Jews. There is little question but that historically the Jews were first to receive the divine word and that the primitive church was made up largely of Jews. Paul himself was a Jew and did not hesitate to ascribe to the Jews a certain priority. But the church was destined to become a predominantly Gentile faith, and hostility between Jews and Christians would reach such proportions as to influence certain early Christian writers as well as those who transmitted the text of the New Testament in the early period.

---

[1] Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 138 f. Creed thinks it improbable that the words were original in the text of Luke. "But the omission of a prayer so sublime and so Christ-like seems less probable than its insertion." See his St. Luke, p. 286.

[2] Leaney, St. Luke, p. 284.

It is not surprising that Marcion's text lacks the word πρῶτον in Romans 1:16. More significant is the fact that this word is also omitted in B G g, Copt. sah., and Ephraem Syrus. This omission may be attributed to the influence of Marcion's text; or, it may be regarded as evidence that the original text lacked this word.[1] Westcott and Hort placed it in brackets to indicate some doubt as to its authenticity, but it seems unlikely that the word would have been added unless it was by someone with a pro-Jewish bias. This is not impossible; however, the greater weight of evidence, both internal and external, favors the text which includes the word, and we are probably safe in assuming that here is another instance where Marcion's anti-Judaic bias has affected the text of important manuscripts. Whereas Paul ascribed to the Jews a certain priority, Marcion rejected the idea that the gospel came first to the Jews.

Galatians 5:14

The ordinary text of this verse reads: "For the whole law is fulfilled in one word 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.'" (RSV) Marcion's text of this verse contains a significant alteration; it has "in you" in place of "in one word." Other Western witnesses (D* E F G d g e and Ambrosiaster) conflate the two: "For the whole law is fulfilled in you in one word. . . ." Harnack concluded that Marcion himself inserted "in you," and that, therefore, this is a case of a deliberate Marcionite falsification influencing the Latin tradition.[1] Another explanation for the variant readings in Marcion and the Western text is given by E. C. Blackman, who suggests that Marcion was familiar with the text attested in D and other manuscripts--ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ --and that he "deliberately dropped ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ leaving ἐν ὑμῖν isolated and making possible the interpretation: in you Christians and not in the Jews!"[2]

---

[1] See Blackman, Marcion, pp. 45, 168, who thinks that the reading in g is to be attributed to the influence of Marcion's text.

Regardless of the origin of the reading found in the Western manuscripts, whether it is to be attributed to the influence of Marcion's text or not, it lends itself to the interpretation which Marcion evidently placed upon it in the second century. When seen against the background of a strong anti-Judaic polemic in certain Christian circles of that time, the Western reading may well have been introduced in order to provide support for the view that fulfillment of the law is to be seen in the lives of Christians rather than Jews.

Eschatological Perspectives of the Early Christian Community

If we may judge from the record of the New Testament, the primitive church was conscious of living in the "last days," and of the immediacy of the kingdom of God. (See, e.g., Acts 2:17 ff., Rom. 13:11-14, I Cor. 7:29-31.) This eschatological consciousness was doubtless the result of the impact which the mission and message of Jesus had made upon the small band of disciples who were witnesses of his ministry, death, and resurrection, together with the fact that these disciples were Jews whose background was probably conditioned by a strong eschatological emphasis.

---

[1] See his *Marcion*, pp. 78*, 153*.

[2] Blackman, *Marcion*, p. 160.

As time passed and the fulfillment of the Christian hope seemed to be delayed, some believers found it necessary to adjust their thinking accordingly. Thus, in the Gospel of John there is a definite emphasis on the present reality of salvation as God's gift to believers, while at the same time the final work of God in raising the dead is still a future event (cf. John 5:25-29, 11:23-25). Other New Testament writers simply place the coming of Christ and the end of the age in the more distant future without losing sight of its significance for the present. Meanwhile they spoke of entering the kingdom and of conducting their lives in accordance with a new order of existence breaking in upon the present age while the latter was regarded as passing away.

These changes in the eschatological outlook of the Christian community are likewise reflected in certain textual variations in the New Testament, indicating the fact that early scribes were aware of the problems raised by the eschatological views expressed in the various writings of the New Testament.

John 5:25

The Fourth Evangelist was persuaded that the words of Jesus possess a life-giving power for those who hear and believe. Even the spiritually dead, when they hear his voice, will live. Thus he writes: "Truly, truly, I say to you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live." (RSV) The phrase "and now is" is found in most witnesses, but is omitted by the original hand of Codex

Sinaiticus, two Old Latin manuscripts (a b), and Tertullian. That the phrase is Johannine may be seen from its use in 4:23, together with the fact that the Evangelist frequently reveals his perspective as that of the church after Pentecost. Therefore, when he employs the phrase "and now is," he is making a more direct application of Jesus' words to the present situation of his readers.

In verses 25-29 what is commonly referred to as "realized" and "futuristic" eschatology are mingled. The Son of God already has authority to give life and to execute judgment in virtue of his role as the Son of man. And the hour is coming when the dead will hear his voice and come forth out of the tombs. Evidently some early scribe failed to make any distinction between what the Evangelist meant to say in verse 25 and what is implied in verses 28-29, for in the latter the resurrection of those who are in the tombs clearly refers to the future resurrection of the physically dead. The omission of "and now is" in verse 25 has the effect of making the entire verse refer (as in 29 f.) to a future event. Thus an important aspect of Johannine thought as reflected in verse 25 is subordinated to the prevailing futuristic eschatology which dominated the primitive thought of the church.

John 8:12

The correct tense of the verb is sometimes involved in textual variations in the New Testament, especially in the Gospel of John where verb tense is often an important factor in the Evangelist's many assertions concerning the nature of salvation. In 8:12 Jesus is reported as saying: "I am the light of the world; he who follows me will not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life." (RSV) Two manuscripts (S* e) support the reading, " . . . but has the light of life." These witnesses emphasize the present fact that the follower of Jesus now has the light of life. Here the present tense of the verb replaces the future tense with the result that the text of this verse is made to agree with the Johannine use of the present tense in other passages describing what is already a possibility for believers (cf. 3:36, 5:24, I John 1:7).

John 11:25

The usual text of this verse reads: "Jesus said to her, 'I am the resurrection and the life. . . .'" (RSV) The words "and the life" are omitted by P45 a 1, Syr. sin., Cyprian, and sometimes Origen. Although the longer reading is supported by many more ancient witnesses, and is probably the correct one, the shorter text is noteworthy for the wide geographical distribution of its support. It is certainly an early reading which must have been widely known by the beginning of the third century. C. K. Barrett makes the following comment on it:

> This short text may well be original; it is entirely suitable to the context, yet the addition is one which might easily be made by a copyist. It makes little difference to the sense, though the short text emphasizes more sharply the fulfillment of eschatology in Jesus himself.

In verse 24 Martha is reported as saying, "I know that he will rise again in the resurrection at the last day." (RSV) To this Jesus replied: "I am the resurrection and the life." (RSV) These words do not repudiate the Jewish doctrine of a final resurrection of the righteous, but rather affirm that the eschatological age had begun with the ministry of Jesus.[1] The shorter text focuses attention on the resurrection, which, as Martha's words imply, was generally understood as an eschatological event ("at the last day"), and it affirms that the powers of the new age are already present in the person of Jesus himself.

---

[1] Howard, "St. John," p. 644.

Romans 8:23

In this section of his letter to the Romans (8:14-25) Paul describes the life of the believer as a life of hope. Like the creation, which is in bondage to decay and has been groaning in travail until now, "we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly as we wait for adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies." (RSV, vs. 23) However, P46 (*videtur*) D G, some Old Latin manuscripts, and Ambrosiaster omit υἱοθεσίαν . The passage reads smoothly enough without this word, which is translated "adoption as sons" in the RSV. On the other hand, it is likely that the original text included the word, which would suggest that Paul evidently regarded our "adoption as sons" as our final acceptance into God's family. The "redemption of our bodies" must then be a synonym of our final adoption.[1]

Some early scribe apparently could not accept the suggestion that "we wait for adoption as sons"; instead, he may have reasoned, our sonship is already established. This is doubtless the interpretation given to Paul's words in verse 15, where he declares: "You have received the Spirit of adoption" (υἱοθεσίας). The RSV translators took the word "spirit" here to mean "attitude" or "state of mind," and therefore rendered the phrase "the spirit of sonship," but the context suggests that Paul is referring to the divine spirit.[2] The gift of the Spirit is thus regarded by Paul as the "first fruits" of salvation (vs. 23), as an anticipation of final redemption and a pledge that we who have the Spirit will in the end be saved. Even so, "we groan inwardly as we wait for adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies." (Vs. 23) The text which omits "adoption as sons" implies that our sonship is already fully realized.

---

[1] See Barrett, *Epistle to the Romans*, p. 167.

[2] See Knox, "Romans," p. 516.

Hebrews 9:11

The best-attested reading in the first part of this verse is translated as follows in the NEB: "But now Christ has come, high priest of good things already in being." The phrase "already in being" translates the Greek γενομένων, which is attested in P46 B D* 1739, the Old Latin, Syr. pesh. and hkl., and Origen. Another reading substitutes the word μελλόντων, which would alter the text to read: " . . . high priest of good things to come." This variant is found in S A I, most Byzantine manuscripts, f, the Vulgate and Syr. hkl. mg. It is the traditional reading of the *Textus Receptus but* was also adopted by Tischendorf. The first reading suits the context better, for the writer is contrasting the present blessings made available through the high-priesthood of Christ with the performances of other priests rather than the present and future benefits of Christ's work as priest. The writer of Hebrews implies elsewhere that believers have already begun to participate in many of the benefits and blessings made available through Christ (cf. 6:4-5). On the other hand, "the law has but a shadow of the good things to come instead of the true form of these realities" (RSV, 10:1); yet "we have been consecrated through the offering of the body of Christ once for all." (RSV, 10:10)

If the text which reads "good things to come" in 9:11 is secondary, it may have arisen because some scribe thought that the blessings of the priestly work of Christ are yet to be fully applied to believers. The "good things" are not a present experience but a future inheritance of the saints.

The kingdom of God and the coming of Christ are important themes in the eschatological views of early Christians. Many textual variations occur in passages dealing with these topics, some of which are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Luke 23:42

The last words of the penitent thief on the cross are given to us in the familiar reading: "Jesus, remember me when you come in your kingdom." The RSV translates the last phrase "in your kingly power." This reading (ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου) is found in S A W fam. 1 fam. 13, most Byzantine manuscripts, and the Old Latin (a b q), Origen, and Eusebius. Another reading (εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου) is attested in B L c e f ff^2 l, the Latin Vulgate, Origen (lat.), and Hilary. It was adopted by Westcott-Hort and by Nestle and was preferred by the NEB translators, who rendered this phrase "to your throne." A third reading is found in D d which may be translated, "in the day of your mercy."

The second reading, found in B L and some Old Latin manuscripts, may well be the original form of the text in view of the parallel Lukan expression εἰς τὴν δόξαν in Luke 24:26. Furthermore, the alternative readings, "in your kingdom" and "in the day of your mercy," reflect a progressive tendency to create specific references to the *parousia* out of sayings that originally had no such reference.[1]

In discussing the Lukan theology as it relates to the phrase "to enter into his glory" in 24:26, J. M. Creed writes: "It is to be noted that emphasis falls upon the glorification of Christ at the Resurrection and remains there. The Parousia is not the centre of hope and faith."[1] If this comment on the parallel expression in 24:26 is a valid statement concerning Lukan theology, it becomes even more clear that the reading supported by B L and others refers to the exaltation of Christ in the Resurrection while the alternative readings refer to the coming of Christ and the consummation of the kingdom. For this reason the former is more likely to represent what the Evangelist wrote while the reading in Sinaiticus *et al*. and the text of D represent attempts to create a reference to the *parousia* where there was none before.

---

[1] Tasker, *The Greek New Testament*, p. 424.

Luke 16:16

Luke gives a simpler form of a saying which is found in a more obscure form in Matthew 11:12-13. The ordinary text of Luke 16:16 reads: "The law and the prophets were until John; since then the good news of the kingdom of God is preached, and every one enters it violently." (RSV) This reading is supported by most ancient witnesses; however, the original hand of Codex Sinaiticus, the scribe of G, and a few other manuscripts omit the last clause--"and every one enters it violently." The use of the word βιάζεται with its connotation of violence or force must have seemed inappropriate to some scribes in connection with the preaching of the kingdom of God. The idea that anyone might take the kingdom by storm would doubtless have been repulsive to many. It should be noted that the omission of this clause also has the effect of removing a reference to the kingdom of God as a fact of present experience for those who struggle to enter it. That the good news of the kingdom of God is preached since the days of John sounds obvious enough, but to add that "every one enters it violently" implies that men may now press their way into it. This last clause might therefore have been omitted because of its suggestion that the new age is already present and men are pressing into it.

---

[1] *St. Luke*, p. 297.

Mark 10:24

Entrance into the kingdom of God is also the subject of this verse in the Gospel of Mark. Some early witnesses attest a form of the text which reports Jesus as saying, "Children, how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!" (RSV) This reading is found in S B W k and the Coptic versions. A longer text is found in C D Koridethi, many Byzantine manuscripts, and Clement of Alexandria, which reads: "Children, how hard it is for those who trust in riches to enter the kingdom of God." The addition of the phrase "for those who trust in riches" qualifies the statement concerning the difficulty of entering the kingdom by limiting this difficulty to those who trust in their possessions. It also weakens the force of verse 23, which declares that it will be hard for those who have riches to enter the kingdom. The longer form of the text in verse 24 is, in the judgment of most critics, the result of a later addition. It alters the meaning of this stark saying of Jesus by adding a condition which permits a less restrictive interpretation of Jesus' words, so that those who have possessions (vs. 23) are not required to renounce them in order to enter the kingdom of God. There may be some significance in the fact that Mark 10:24 is omitted by both Matthew and Luke, even though Luke seems to uphold the idea of complete renunciation elsewhere (14:33).

Mark 10:25

The well-known text of this verse reads: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God." (RSV) But Clement of Alexandria quotes this passage in an alternate form: "It is easier . . . than for a rich man to be a philosopher." (Stromata ii. 5) That Clement himself introduced this variation seems likely. Concerning this reading R. B. Tollington writes:

> Christianity being in Clement's eyes the true philosophy, the last phrase is not an unnatural equivalent to write in place of the words, "enter into the kingdom of God," which stands in the Synoptic Gospels. But it is clearly an intentional variation, not a different reading.[1]

This alteration by Clement represents an accommodation of the language and thought of the New Testament to the more sophisticated and philosophically oriented culture of Alexandria. Such a change in the text of one of the early fathers gives strong support to the argument that the text of a given time and place may reflect the theological climate in which it was produced.

I Corinthians 15:51

Codex Vaticanus and the great majority of Byzantine manuscripts support the text of this verse which is translated, "We shall not all sleep but we shall all be changed." This reading is also found in the Syriac versions, the Coptic, one Old Latin witness (m) and Tertullian. In the context Paul is referring to his expectation that not all believers will die before the *parousia* but all believers, the living and the dead, will be changed instantly when the last trumpet sounds. Since the *parousia* was expected soon, this interpretation appears to suit the context very well. But other readings are attested in important witnesses. Jerome (Epist. 119) preferred a text which reads: "We shall all sleep, but we shall not all be changed." (S A C G 33 *et al.*) This reading could have arisen in order to correct history, when Paul and his contemporaries had died and the end had not yet come; or, it could be understood as an affirmation of the view that "all people are subject to death but some, the believers, will survive death and be transformed."[1] However, the latter interpretation does not coincide as well with Paul's statement concerning the parousia and the resurrection in I Thessalonians 4:15-18 as does the interpretation provided by the first reading above.

---

[1] R. B. Tollington, *Clement of Alexandria*, II, 178.

A third reading is found in P46, which attests the form: "We shall not all sleep, nor shall we all be changed." This form of the text need not imply a different interpretation if we assume that it represents the original. Thus Paul could have been referring to the people of his generation, not all of whom would die, nor would all be changed. However, it is more likely that an early scribe inserted the negative particle before "all" in the second clause because he could not accept the suggestion that "we shall all be changed."

A fourth form of the text, found in D*, some Old Latin manuscripts, the Latin Vulgate, Marcion and Tertullian, reads: "We shall all rise but we shall not all be changed." This reading represents a significant difference of interpretation. It declares that all men will be raised from the dead, believers and unbelievers, but not all will be transformed. According to Tertullian, who employed this form of the text in his Resurrection of the Flesh, xlii, only those who are alive can be or need to be transformed, for the dead, whose bodies have decayed, have no substantial body to be changed. Hence, only the bodies of the living will be changed, though all believers will be saved. Later, however, Tertullian expresses the view that the deteriorated bodies of the dead will be restored and will be subject to a transformation like that of the living.

---

[1] Clark, "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," p. 63. The writer is indebted to Prof. Clark's treatment of this passage in this and the following paragraphs.

Such diverse forms of the text in I Corinthians 15:51 indicate the importance of this passage in early interpretations of the doctrine of the resurrection and illustrate the variety of possible interpretations applied to the text by those who made use of it as the basis for their views on the resurrection.

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS

Among the countless thousands of textual variants which have been found to exist in hundreds of witnesses (Greek manuscripts, versions, and fathers) to the text of the New Testament there are a great many which may be regarded as intentional. We are compelled to acknowledge a variety of motives as scribes made deliberate changes in order to harmonize parallel passages or quotations from the Old Testament, to correct what they considered to be errors (grammatical, historical, etc.), to improve the language, to preserve by conflation alternate forms of the text, and to "correct" or "improve" the text in the interests of doctrine. Although textual scholars have long recognized the existence of various types of alterations, depending upon the possible motives involved, there has been a reluctance to acknowledge that textual changes could have occurred because of doctrinal views held by those who transmitted the text. The suggestion by a few notable critics, such as J. Rendel Harris and Kirsopp Lake, that doctrinal motivation must have been an important factor in accounting for significant variations in the text was practically ignored by the great majority of their contemporaries, who were persuaded by the denial of an older generation of textual experts that the manuscripts of the New Testament could have been altered for doctrinal reasons. We have referred earlier to the statement by Hort "that even among the numerous unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes."[1] To this view Rendel Harris objected and caustically observed that "to Hort the scribes were all angels, as far as theology was concerned."[2]

It has been rightly observed that Hort's use of terms like "perceptible fraud," "wilful tampering" and "deliberate falsification" are not the terms we should employ in describing the intent of scribes who modified the text. Such allegations as these gratuitously imply an evil or unethical intention which may be quite foreign to the true motivation.[3] It is, nevertheless, true that some scribes modified the text at many points where questions of doctrine are involved. We need only observe the divergent forms of the text to realize that changes affecting the sense of a great many passages have been made. The textual scholar is no longer justified in assuming that scribes would not have allowed their own theological beliefs to influence their handling of the text.

The view that the words of the Biblical text were too sacred to be altered for reasons of doctrine was generally held in Protestant circles in the nineteenth century and earlier. It was in part this belief that the words of Holy Scripture had been providentially preserved from error which helps to explain the long uninterrupted reign of the Textus Receptus, despite several noteworthy attempts by individual scholars in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to produce a critical text. But this view of the text was not shared previously by the scribes who produced copies of New Testament writings in the earliest centuries. Nor was it fully subscribed to by their successors in the

---

[1] Hort, Introduction, p. 282.

[2] See his Sidelights, p. 35.

[3] See Clark, "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation," p. 5.

Byzantine period. An examination of the apparatus criticus in Nestle's latest edition of the New Testament, for example, will reveal that scribes exercised considerable freedom in transmitting the text with the result that the problem of recovering the "original" form of the documents is a complicated and exacting task. The fact that no single manuscript or group of manuscripts has preserved the authentic text is now generally recognized.

What is not generally acknowledged is that doctrinal motivation is probably as important as other factors in explaining the origin of significant variations in the New Testament. Even though the view of Hort (and others) has been challenged by reputable scholars, only a limited amount of scholarly work has been done to indicate the extent to which doctrinal considerations are involved in textual changes. There is still a tendency among scholars to think that doctrinal alterations represent such an infinitesimal number of non-accidental variations as to make no appreciable difference in the interpretation of the text. Even some textual critics who are willing to acknowledge that tendentious or doctrinal modifications exist have minimized their importance and have hastened to add a word of reassurance that Christian doctrine is not affected by any such variations in the text.[1]

We need not take the view that a particular doctrine stands or falls by the testimony of a significant textual variation, but it is a reasonable contention that the development of particular doctrines has at times been affected by the form of the text known and used in the church.

Most textual changes affecting matters of doctrine or reflecting a theological tendency are not bold strokes of the pen aimed at obliterating all reference to an idea or teaching and substituting another in its place. It is true that Marcion's treatment of the text of Luke and the Pauline epistles accepted by him shows this extreme objective, but the scribes who transmitted the text of our extant witnesses were generally much more conservative in their handling of the Scriptures. Their modifications of the text were usually more subtle and less obvious. There is, after all, a distinctly conservative element involved in the task of copying the Scriptures. One whose main preoccupation is that of reproducing a text for the instruction and edification of the church will make an effort to be faithful to the tradition as it is recorded in available manuscripts. But where he finds the text of his exemplar in disagreement with other manuscripts or other sources of information, he in his role of interpreter must decide which is the proper reading.

---

[1] See Vaganay, Introduction, p. 12; Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, p. 23.

Further, it should be pointed out that drastic changes in the text are not necessary in order to produce different interpretations of doctrine. A minor alteration is usually sufficient to give support to an alternate point of view. Although other important factors have contributed to the diversity of beliefs and practices of the Christian churches, the interpretation of the New Testament text has had a part in creating this diversity, and this has happened in spite of the verbal similarity in the texts used by the various churches.

While other types of textual changes may account for a large number of significant variations in the text, it is certain that no other type provides a more fascinating and rewarding subject of investigation than those which involve points of doctrine. Combing through an apparatus criticus in search of significant variants may appear to some a tedious and unrewarding task, but the results of this search can be an exhilarating experience. To discover, for example, the fluidity of the text in many passages and the theological vitality of the Scriptures as suggested by the variations introduced at different points in the history of the text is a reminder that the New Testament was never understood to be a static entity but rather the record of a dynamic and living word, particularly in the earlier centuries of the church.

Many of the variants exhibited in this study have not been discussed elsewhere in terms of their theological significance. Although modern commentators will frequently call attention to variant readings in the text because of their textual support, they seldom discuss the implications of such readings for the interpretation of the passages in which they are found. In the past a few scholars have given brief attention to selected textual variations in order to illustrate the presence of doctrinal alterations in the text or to exhibit various types of textual problems. Such limited studies have provided additional sources from which to gather a considerable number of textual variants which may be understood to have theological significance.

The writer has exhibited and discussed herein more than one hundred and seventy-five selected passages containing such variants. In many of these examples scribal motivation along doctrinal lines is apparent. The number of such passages might be increased several times by a more exhaustive comparison of selected witnesses to the text. The fact that our investigation was not limited to a few important witnesses indicates that doctrinal variants are to be found in a wide range of textual authorities. Although this study is far from exhaustive, it demonstrates, among other things, that the number and significance of doctrinal variations in the text is much greater than is generally assumed. The cumulative weight and critical significance of such variations should no longer be disregarded by the exegetes and theologians who interpret the text of the New Testament. If anyone should argue that the task of the exegete is to interpret the original text, then he needs to be reminded that as yet no such text has been recovered.[1] For this reason the exegete or theologian must take into account all significant variations in the text before he attempts to interpret the meaning of a passage.

It is a commonly accepted view that the great majority of significant variants arose in the first hundred years of the history of the text. However, a considerable number of variants have been treated in the foregoing pages for which we have only the testimony of later witnesses. If more attention should be given to the variant readings which appear in later witnesses, it is predictable that a greater number of variants introduced into the text at a later period would be found which have theological significance. Many such variants are not given in the better known apparatus critici because they are not regarded as early enough to be considered as belonging to the original text or to an early form of the text. Yet every doctrinal variant is significant not only because of what it reveals concerning the history of the interpretation of the text but also because of the light which it throws upon the history of Christian thought.

It is only in recent decades that textual critics have begun to recognize the value of later readings in the text as representing the views of Christians living at a particular time and place. Where there are significant variations in the text it must be remembered that every form of the text represents the Scriptures as they were known and used in the locality where such textual variants arose or were transmitted by the scribes. The textual critic who views the text in this manner will not confine his attention to the task of recovering the "original" autographs but will give due attention to every significant reading because of its importance in revealing how the New Testament was read and interpreted at different times and places in the history of the church. The need for more intensive studies of local texts and of major recensions at various stages of development, focusing attention on theological tendencies in textual alterations, becomes more apparent as a result of this investigation.

---

[1] On this point K. W. Clark recently remarked: "We may well begin to ask if there really was a stable text at the beginning. We talk of recovering the original text, and of course every document has such a text. But the earliest witnesses to [the] NT text even from the first century already show such variety and freedom that we may well wonder if the text remained stable long enough to hold a priority. Great progress has been achieved in recovering an early form of the text, but it may be doubted that there is evidence of one original text to be recovered." See "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation," p. 16.

In order that he may discover the variety of influences which have had some bearing upon the origin of different forms of the text in the history of its transmission, the textual critic must be a student of church history and of the history of Christian thought. If he is to recognize the many interrelationships between textual variations and the religio-historical situations in which they originated, the textual scholar should profit from the work of church historians and theologians who are interested in the role of the Scriptures in shaping the life and thought of the church, as well as in the impact of various men and movements upon the interpretation of the Scriptures. In turn, the textual critic can make an important contribution to the work of the theologian and historian, by showing what particular forms of the text were used in certain areas at a given time. Additional studies in the text of the later fathers will aid greatly in revealing how the New Testament was read and interpreted in specific regions or localities. The modest attempt which has been made in this study to discuss certain textual variants in the light of particular historical and theological contexts is an indication of the possibilities for further study of the text along these lines.

There are certain pitfalls to be avoided in this type of study, such as the desire to start with certain theological controversies and then look for textual phenomena which fit into our expectations of what ought to have happened. This can be avoided if the critic begins with the evidence found in the various forms of the text and, whenever possible, endeavors to explain the variations in the text in relation to the Sitz im Leben of the church.

In discussing certain variants which appear in the text the writer has repeatedly called attention to the possible influence of Marcionite, Tatianic and other "heretical" views on the text. Although the number of such passages in which "heretical" views may be reflected is not large, we should not expect our extant manuscripts to reveal many such instances, because of the care which leaders of the church would have taken to purge the manuscripts of any signs of heretical influence. However, it has also been shown that heretics were not the only ones to alter the text. Church fathers like Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen and later writers have stated their preference for certain readings and have thus contributed to the rising or falling of variant forms of the text. Furthermore, some evidence has been exhibited in this study to show that scribes and fathers sought to "correct" or "improve" the text where they felt it had suffered corruption by heretics or careless scribes.

Very often it is difficult for the textual scholar to identify with certainty the motives which gave rise to particular forms of the text, even when the existing variations involve significant theological issues; however, it is possible for him to recognize that a difference of theological interpretation exists in the choice between two or more variant readings in a given passage. At this point the writer has endeavored to make a significant contribution to a theological approach to textual criticism by giving attention to the theological implications of alternative readings in numerous passages dealing with matters of faith and practice which have been of vital interest to Christians at various times in the history of the church. Whereas the motives which could account for the origin of many variant readings may not be so apparent, the actual results upon interpretation suggested by a comparison of divergent readings in textual witnesses will frequently reveal certain theological tendencies.

Although the question of the original text has at times been brought into the discussion, it was not introduced with the primary aim of determining the primitive reading in every case. When this question was raised, an effort was made to indicate the possible meaning of the text for the author, whether he wrote variant "a" or "b," and also the meaning of the text as altered in either direction. In other instances where an ambiguity in the form of the text exists, the writer has demonstrated the thesis that a significant difference of theological interpretation is discernible in the choice of variant readings. In many cases these variants have been found to involve theological issues of great importance to the church or to some segment of the Christian community, as judged by historians of Christian thought.

In Chapter II of this study the writer has discussed selected textual variations bearing upon the doctrine of God. Most of these involved questions concerning the nature of God, with which the fathers of the church wrestled in the Nicene period or earlier. Although the number of such variants treated in this study may not be great, they reflect the concern of early Christians to interpret correctly the doctrine of God, even when this involved the alteration or "improvement" of the text of the Scriptures. In some cases the addition, omission, or substitution of a word, a phrase, or an entire clause had the effect of revising the interpretation of a given passage to give support to the reviser's point of view, which may or may not have been shared by the church as a whole. The variations reflecting Marcionite views concerning God and those which reflect a desire to find support for the doctrine of the Trinity in Holy Scripture present two examples of this literary phenomenon.

A major concern in the early church, as reflected in several textual variations exhibited herein, was the relationship between the Father and the Son or between the Son, the Father, and the Spirit. This issue was raised because the belief that Jesus is divine was held concurrently with the conviction that God is one. The doctrine of the Trinity may be said to have resulted from the church's experience and reflection upon the meaning of Jesus Christ in relation to God. Once the doctrine of the Trinity was formulated, the desire to find explicit reference to this theological tenet in the Scriptures probably explains the interpolation at I John 5:7-8.

In Chapter III of this study the writer has exhibited a great many passages in the New Testament containing textual variations bearing upon Christological issues that have often elicited comments from the best minds of the church. The scope of these variations reflects the different views of Christians concerning such matters as the virginal conception, the divine-human nature of Christ, the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, and the proper titles to be assigned to the church's Lord and Savior. Most of these variations in the text show a concern to exalt the person of Christ, to state correctly what Christians believe about him, and to avoid any expression which might give a false interpretation of his person or his role as the divine Son of God.

That so many textual variations involving an understanding of the person and work of Christ should be found in our extant witnesses is not surprising in view of the widespread importance of Christological issues in the early history of the church. Although Christians gradually arrived at a consensus on major aspects of the doctrine of Christ, there has never been unanimity on all questions concerning the meaning of "the Christ event." A tendency often reflected in textual variants bearing on the person of Christ is the desire to emphasize his divine nature, either by giving support to some theological tenet like the doctrine of the Virginal Conception or by ascribing to him the title of deity, or by altering the text in order to eliminate what was doctrinally unacceptable or possibly offensive to some believers.

In the fourth chapter attention is given to selected passages containing variants which bear upon several aspects of the life of the Christian community. The work of the Spirit in guiding and sustaining the church, the spiritual and moral requirements of the Christian life, the ritual and liturgy of the church, and the relations between Christians and Jews were all matters of great concern to the scribes who transmitted the text of the New Testament. This concern is clearly reflected in passages where textual witnesses attest two or more divergent readings which suggest alternative interpretations affecting matters of faith and practice.

Certain patterns of thought and practice are evident in the variants which have been discussed in this chapter. There are signs that the text of the New Testament has been affected by a growing emphasis on fasting, abstinence from certain foods, celibacy, and other practices which characterize the disciplines of asceticism. There are likewise indications of the influence of ritual and liturgical usages on the form of the text. Most striking is the anti-Judaic tendency which is found in certain Western witnesses, in particular Codex D and its allies in Acts, and in Marcion, along with several important Western manuscripts, in the Gospel of Luke. All these interests reflect and contribute to the formulation of the major doctrines of the church.

The tendencies reflected in textual variations reveal that the text of the New Testament was conditioned by many influences, particularly in the early history of the church. We would propose that such textual changes in turn had some effect upon the shaping of doctrine and practice in those areas where the emended texts were used. Had it not been so, there would have been no reason for certain early fathers of the church to accuse their antagonists of corrupting the Scriptures, nor would the attempt to stabilize the form of the text during the third and fourth centuries have been so important for the maintenance of sound doctrine.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aland, Kurt. "Eine Bemerkung zur gegenwärtigen Arbeit der neutestamentlichen Textkritik," *Biblische Zeitschrift*, IV (1960), 315-318. *N.V.*

_______. *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments, I. Gesamtübersicht* ("Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung," vol. I.) Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963.

_______. "Neue Testamentliche Papyri II," *New Testament Studies*, IX (1962-63), 303-316; X (1963-64), 62-79.

_______. "The New Nestle Greek New Testament," *New Testament Studies*, VI (1960), 179-184.

_______. "The Present Position of New Testament Textual Criticism," *Studia Evangelica: Papers Presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957. Edited by Kurt Aland et al.* ("Texte und Untersuchungen," LXXIII.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959, pp. 717-731.

Armstrong, William P. "Critical Note (Matt. 1:16)," *Princeton Theological Review*, XIII (1915), 461-468. *N.V.*

Bacon, Benjamin W. "Some 'Western' Variants in the Text of Acts," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXI (1928), 113-145.

Baird, William R., Jr. "Current Trends in New Testament Study," *Journal of Religion*, XXXIX (1959), 137-153.

Barnard, P. M. *The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria in the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.* ("Texts and Studies," vol. V, no. 5.) Cambridge: at the University Press, 1899.

Barrett, Charles Kingsley. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.* ("Harper's New Testament Commentaries") New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1957.

_______. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Notes on the Greek Text.* London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1955.

Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament.* Translated and adapted by William F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Bauer, Walter. *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum.* Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1934; Zweite, durchgesehene auflage mit einem Nachtrag von Georg Strecker. ("Beitrage zur Historischen Theologie," vol. X) Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1964.

Beare, Francis Wright. *The First Epistle of Peter*. 2nd ed. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1958.

________. "The Text of I Peter in Papyrus 72," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXX (1961), 253-260.

Benoit, Pierre. "Le récit de la Cène dans Lc. XXII, 15-20: Étude de critique textuelle et littéraire," *Revue Biblique*, XLVIII (1939), 357-393.

Berger, Samuel. *Histoire de la Vulgate*. Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie., 1893.

Berkhof, Hendrikus. *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1964.

Bernard, J. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. Edited by A. H. McNeile. 2 vols. ("The International Critical Commentary") Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928.

Birdsall, J. N. "Current Trends and Present Tasks in NT Textual Criticism," *Baptist Quarterly*, XVII (1957), 109-114.

Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. 2nd ed. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1954.

Blackman, E. C. *Marcion and His Influence*. London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1948.

Bludau, Augustinus. "Das Comma Johanneum bei den Griechen," *Biblische Zeitschrift*, XIII (1915), 26-50, 130-162, 222-243.

Boismard, M.-E. "'Dans le sein du Père' (Jo. I, 18)," *Revue Biblique*, LIX (1952), 23-39.

________. "De son ventre couleront des fleuves d'eau (Jo. vii, 38)," *Revue Biblique*, LXV (1958), 523-546.

Brandhuber, P. "Die sekundären Lesarten bei 1 Kor. 15, 51; Ihre Verbreitung und Entstehung," *Biblica*, XVIII (1937), 303-333, 418-438. *N.V.*

Brooke, A. E. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles.* ("The International Critical Commentary") New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.

Brown, Francis, Samuel R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1907.

Brown, Raymond E. "Does the New Testament Call Jesus God?" *Theological Studies*, XXVI (1965), 545-573.

Buchanan, E. S. "Ancient Testimony to the Early Corruption of the Gospels," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXIII (1916), 177-191.

Burgon, John William, and Edward Miller. *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*. London: George Bell and Sons, 1896.

________. *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*. London: George Bell and Sons, 1896.

Burkitt, F. C. "The Chester Beatty Papyri," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXIV (1933), 363-369.

________. *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*. 2 vols. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1904.

________. "On Luke xxii 17-20," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXVIII (1926-27), 178-181.

Casey, Robert P., Silva Lake, Agnes K. Lake. *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends*. London: Christophers, [1937].

Chadwick, Henry. "The Shorter Text of Luke XXII. 15-20," *Harvard Theological Review*, L (1957), 249-258.

________ and J.E.L. Oulton (eds.). *Alexandrian Christianity*. ("The Library of Christian Classics," vol. II.) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954.

Clark, Albert C. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes on Selected Passages*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933.

________. *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1914.

Clark, Kenneth W. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937.

________. "The Effect of Recent Textual Criticism upon New Testament Studies," *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*. Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube in honour of C. H. Dodd. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1964, pp. 27-51.

________. "The Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament," *New Testament Manuscript Studies: The Materials and the Making of a Critical Apparatus*. Edited by M. M. Parvis and A. P. Wikgren. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950, pp. 1-24.

________. "The Text of the Gospel of John in Third-Century Egypt," *Novum Testamentum*, V (1962), 17-24.

________. "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," *Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwaan*. Edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik. Haarlem: De Ervin F. Bohn N.V., 1953, pp. 52-65.

Clark, Kenneth W. "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXV (1966), 1-16.

Colwell, Ernest C. "Biblical Criticism: Lower and Higher," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXVII (1948), 1-12.

________. "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and Limitations," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXVI (1947), 109-133.

________. "Mark 16:9-20 in the Armenian Version," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LVI (1937), 369-386.

________. *What Is the Best New Testament?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

________ and E. W. Tune. "Variant Readings: Classifications and Use," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXIII (1964), 253-261.

Conybeare, F. C. "Three Early Doctrinal Modifications of the Text of the Gospels," *The Hibbert Journal*, I (1902-03), 96-113.

Couchoud, Paul-Lewis. "Notes sur le Text de St. Marc dans le Codex Chester Beatty," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXV (1934), 3-22.

Creed, John Martin. *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1930.

Crehan, Joseph. "Peter According to the D-Text of Acts," *Theological Studies*, XVIII (1957), 596-603.

Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Trans. by S. C. Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

________. "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXIV (1955), 213-226.

Danker, F. W. "Menander and the New Testament," *New Testament Studies*, X (1964), 365-368.

Deichgräber, R. "Lc. 2:14:anthrōpoi eudokias," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LI (1960), 132.

Dodd, Charles Harold. *According to the Scriptures*. London: Nisbet and Company, 1952.

________. *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Dunkerly, Roderic. "Was Barrabas Also Called Jesus?" *Expository Times*, LXXIV (1963), 126-127.

Duplacy, Jean. "Critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, L (1962), 242-263, 564-598.

———. *Où en est la Critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament?* Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie., 1959.

Easton, Burton Scott. *The Gospel According to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

Edmunds, A. J. "The End of Mark in the Curetonian Syriac and the Futility of Using It to Support the Appendix," *Monist*, XXX (1920), 443-445.

Ehrhardt, A. "Christianity Before the Apostles' Creed," *Harvard Theological Review*, LV (1962), 73-119.

Epp, E. J. "The 'Ignorance Motif' in Acts and Anti-Judaic Tendencies in Codex Bezae," *Harvard Theological Review*, LV (1962), 51-62.

———. "Theological Tendency in the Textual Variants of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis: Anti-Judaic Tendencies in Acts." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1961.

Fascher, Erich. *Textgeschichte als hermeneutische Problem.* Halle (Saale): Veb Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1953.

Fickermann, Norbert. "St. Augustine gegen das 'Comma Johanneum'?" *Biblische Zeitschrift*, XXII (1934), 350-358.

Fitzmyer, J. A. "Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Some Features of Our Oldest Text of Luke," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XXIV (1962), 170-179.

———. "'Peace upon Earth among Men of His Good Will' (Luke 2:14)," *Theological Studies*, XIX (1958), 225-227.

Foakes-Jackson, Frederick J. (ed.). *Beginnings of Christianity.* Part I. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Company, 1920.

———. "Professor C. C. Torrey on the Acts," *Harvard Theological Review*, X (1917), 352-361.

Frame, James Everett. *Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians.* ("The International Critical Commentary") New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.

Gerhardsson, Berger. *Memory and Manuscript.* Trans. by Eric J. Sharpe. Uppsala: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1961.

Gilmour, S. MacLean. "The Gospel According to St. Luke: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible.* Edited by G. A. Buttrick, *et al.* New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952, VIII, 3-434.

Glaue, P. "Einege Stellen, die die Bedeutung des Codex D charakterisieren," *Novum Testamentum*, II (1958), 310-315.

Goguel, Maurice. *The Life of Jesus*. Trans. by Olive Wyon. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. *The New Testament: An American Translation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

________. *Problems of New Testament Translation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.

Gough, Louis F. "The Text of the Earlier Pauline Epistles in the Duke New Testament." Unpublished B.D. thesis, Duke University, 1949.

Grant, Frederick C. "The Citation of Greek Manuscript Evidence in an Apparatus Criticus," *New Testament Manuscript Studies: The Materials and the Making of a Critical Apparatus*. Edited by M. M. Parvis and A. P. Wikgren. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950, pp. 81-94.

________. "The Gospel According to St. Mark: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by G. A. Buttrick, *et al*. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951, VII, 629-917.

________. *The Gospels: Their Origin and their Growth*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1957.

________. "The Greek Text of the New Testament," *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*. The International Council of Religious Education, 1946, pp. 37-43.

________. "Where Form Criticism and Textual Criticism Overlap," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LIX (1940), 11-21.

Grant, Robert M. *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.

________ and David Noel Freedman. *The Secret Sayings of Jesus*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1960.

Greenslade, S. L. (ed.). *Early Latin Theology*. ("The Library of Christian Classics," vol. V.) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956.

Gregory, Caspar René. *Text-kritik des Neuen Testamentes*. 3 vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinricks, 1900-09.

Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt (eds.). *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. 17 vols. London: The Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898-1927.

Grosheide, F. W., and D. Plooij. "Acts 15:29 par., a Suggestion," *Bulletin of the Bezan Club*, VI (1929), 15-16. *N.V.*

Haenchen, Ernst. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959.

Harnack, Adolf von. *History of Dogma*. Trans. from the 3rd German ed. by Neil Buchanan *et al*. 7 vols. ("Theological Translation Library," vols. II, VII-XII) New York: Russell and Russell, 1958.

———. *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*. 2nd ed. ("Texte und Untersuchungen," vol. XLV) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924.

———. *Neue Studien zu Marcion*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1923.

———. "Zwei alte dogmatische Korreckturen im Hebräerbrief," *Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche*. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter und Co., 1931, pp. 235-252.

Harris, J. Rendel. *Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-Called Western Text of the New Testament*. ("Texts and Studies," vol. II, No. 1) Cambridge: at the University Press, 1891.

———. "New Points of View in Textual Criticism," *The Expositor*, 8th series, VII (1914), 316-334.

———. *Side-Lights on New Testament Research*. London: The Kingsgate Press, 1908.

———. "Was the Diatessaron Anti-Judaic?" *Harvard Theological Review*, XVIII (1925), 103-109.

———. "A Western Gloss in John 2:3," *The Expository Times*, XLI (1929-30), 107-109.

Hill, James Hamlyn. *The Gospel of the Lord*. Guernsey: Published for John Whitehead, 1891.

The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952.

Hoskier, H. C. *Codex B and Its Allies*. 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914.

Howard, W. F. "The Gospel According to St. John: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by G. A. Buttrick, *et al*. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952, VIII, 437-811.

———. "The Influence of Doctrine upon the Text of the New Testament," *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, CLXVI (1941), 1-16.

Huston, Hollis Wilburn. "A Critical Survey and Evaluation of the Earliest Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1949.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Trans. from the 2nd German edition by A. Ehrhardt. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.

Johnson, Sherman E. "The Gospel According to St. Matthew: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by G. A. Buttrick, *et al.* 12 vols. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951, VII, 229-625.

________. "Review of *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXII (1953), 199-200.

Karnetzki, Manfred. "Textgeschichte als Überlieferungsgeschichte," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLVII-XLVIII (1956-57), 170-180.

Kee, Howard Clark, Franklin W. Young, and Karlfried Froehlich. *Understanding the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Kenyon, Frederic G. (ed.). *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible*. Eight Fasciculi. London: Emery Walker Ltd., 1933-41.

________. *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. London: Macmillan and Company, 1901.

________. *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*. 4th ed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940.

________. *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible*. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

________. *The Text of the Greek Bible: A Student's Handbook*. 2nd ed. London: Duckworth, 1949.

________. *The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts* ("Proceedings of the British Academy," XXIV) London: Humphrey Milford, 1938.

________ and S.C.E. Legg. "The Textual Data," *The Ministry and the Sacraments*. Edited by Roderic Dunkerley. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1937, pp. 271-286.

Kilpatrick, G. D. "The Transmission of the New Testament and its Reliability," *Bible Translator*, IX (1958), 127-138.

________. "Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XLIV (1943), 24-36.

King, Marchant A. "Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript of Luke," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXXII (1965), 234-240.

________ and R. Patterson. "Textual Studies in the Bodmer Manuscript of John," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, CXVII (1960), 164-171.

Kittel, Rudolf (ed.). *Biblia Hebraica*. 7th ed. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1951.

Klijn, A.F.J. *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts*. Utrecht: Drukkerij v.h. Kemink en Zoon N.V., 1949.

———. "A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts (1949-1959)," *Novum Testamentum*, III (1958-59), 1-27, 161-174.

Knox, John. "The Epistle to the Romans: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by G. A. Buttrick, *et al*. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954, IX, 355-668.

———. *Marcion and the New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Knox, Wilfred L. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1948.

———. St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1925.

Koester, Helmut. "ΓΝΩΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΙ : The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity," *Harvard Theological Review*, LVIII (1965), 279-318.

Kretzmann, P. E. "The Authenticity of Matt. 6:13b and of I Jn. 5:7," *Theological Monthly*, I (1921), 79-82.

Kuhn, G. "Untersuchung über die richtige Textgestalt von Matthäus 1, 16," *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, XXXIV (1923), 362-385. *N.V.*

Lagrange, M.-J. *Critique Textuelle: II La Critique Rationelle* ("Introduction à l'Étude du Nouveau Testament," vol. II) Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie., 1935.

———. "Review of Harnack's *Marcion*," *Revue Biblique*, XXX (1921), 602-611.

Lake, Kirsopp. *Codex 1 of the Gospels and Its Allies* ("Texts and Studies," vol. VII, no. 3) Cambridge: The University Press, 1902.

———. "The Ecclesiastical Text," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXI (1928), 338-357.

———. *The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament*. Oxford: Parker and Son, 1904.

———. *Paul: His Heritage and Legacy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1934.

———. The Text of the Gospels," *Studies in Early Christianity*. Edited by S. J. Case. New York: The Century Co., [1928], 21-47.

———. "*The Text of the New Testament*. 6th ed.; revised by Silva New. London: Rivingtons, 1928.

Lake, Kirsopp, Robert P. Blake and Silva New. "The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXI (1928), 207-404.

Lake, Kirsopp, and Silva Lake. "The Byzantine Text of the Gospels," *Mémorial Lagrange*. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie., 1940, pp. 251-258.

________. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1937.

Lampe, G.W.H. "Holy Spirit," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by G. A. Buttrick, *et al*. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962, II, 626-639.

________. "Modern Issues in Biblical Studies: The Evidence in the New Testament for Early Creeds, Catechisms and Liturgy," *Expository Times*, LXXI (1960), 359-363.

Langkammer, H. "Die Zugehörigkeit des Satzteiles *ho gegonen* in John 1. 3, 4 bei Hieronymus," *Biblische Zeitschrift*, VIII (1964), 295-298.

Lattey, Cuthbert. "The Codex Vaticanus on Romans 9:5," *Expository Times*, XXXIV (1922-23), 331.

Leaney, A.R.C. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*. ("Harper's New Testament Commentaries") New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Lietzmann, Hans. *The Beginnings of the Christian Church*. Vol. I: Trans. by Bertram Lee Woolf. London: I Nicholson and Watson, Ltd., 1937.

Lightfoot, Robert Henry. *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1937.

Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.

MacGregor, G.H.C. "The Acts of the Apostles: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by G. A. Buttrick, *et al*. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954, IX, 1-352.

M'Neile, Alan Hugh. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1915.

________. *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*. 2nd ed., revised by C.S.C. Williams. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

Manson, T. W. "St. Paul's letter to the Romans--and Others," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XXXI (1948), 224-240.

Mehlman, John. "A Note on John 1. 3," *The Expository Times*, LXVII (1955-56), 340, 341.

Menoud, P. H. "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts," *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas: Bulletin II*. Oxford: The Oxonian Press, Ltd., 1951, 19-32.

Metzger, Bruce M. *Annotated Bibliography of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. ("Studies and Documents," vol. XVI.) Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1955.

_______. "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXIV (1945), 457-489.

_______. *Chapters in the History of New Testament Criticism*. ("New Testament Tools and Studies," vol. IV.) Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963.

_______. "The Evidence of the Versions for the Text of the New Testament," *New Testament Manuscript Studies: The Materials and the Making of a Critical Apparatus*. Edited by M. M. Parvis and A. P. Wikgren. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950, pp. 25-68.

_______. "The Influence of Codex Bezae upon the Geneva Bible of 1560," *New Testament Studies*, VIII (1961), 72-77.

_______. "Lord's Prayer, The (Text of)," *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. Edited by L. A. Loetscher. 2 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1955, II, 673-674.

_______. "Lucian and the Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible," *New Testament Studies*, VIII (1962), 189-203.

_______. "On the Citation of Variant Readings of Matt. 1:16," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVII (1958), 361-363.

_______. "Recent Discoveries and Investigations of New Testament Manuscripts," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVIII (1959), 13-20.

_______. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

_______. "Three Learned Printers and Their Unsung Contributions to Biblical Scholarship," *Journal of Religion*, XXXII (1952), 254-262.

Michaels, J. R. "Some Notable Readings of Papyrus Bodmer II," *Bible Translator*, VIII (1957), 150-154.

Moffatt, James. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. ("The International Critical Commentary," vol. XV.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.

Moore, George Foot. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*. 3 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Munck, Johannes. "Jewish Christianity in Post-Apostolic Times," *New Testament Studies*, VI (1960), 103-116.

Nestle, Eberhard. *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament*. Trans. from the 2nd ed. by William Edie ("Theological Translation Library," vol. XIII.) London: Williams Norgate, 1901.

Nestle, D. Eberhard, Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland (eds.). Novum Testamentum Graece. 25th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964.

Neve, J. L. A History of Christian Thought. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1946.

The New English Bible: New Testament. London and New York: Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Nicoll, W. Robertson (ed.). The Expositor's Greek Testament. 5 vols. New York: George H. Doran Company, n.d.

Oliver, Harold H. "Present Trends in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," Journal of Bible and Religion, XXX (1962), 308-320.

Parker, Pierson. "Three Variant Readings in Luke-Acts," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII (1964), 165-170.

Parvis, Merrill M. "The Nature and Tasks of New Testament Textual Criticism: An Appraisal," Journal of Religion, XXXII (1952), 165-174.

_______. "Text, NT," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick, et al. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962, IV, 594-614.

_______ and Allen P. Wikgren (eds.). New Testament Manuscript Studies: The Materials and the Making of a Critical Apparatus. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Peterson, Theodore C. "An Early Coptic Manuscript of Acts: An Unrevised Version of the Ancient So-called Western Text," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXVI (1964), 225-241.

Piper, Otto A. "I John and the Didache of the Primitive Church," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVI (1947), 440-444.

Plooij, Daniël. "Eine enkratitische Glosse im Diatessaron," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXII (1923), 1-16.

_______. Tendentieuse Varianten in den Text der Evangeliën. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1926.

Porter, Calvin L. "Papyrus Bodmer XV (75) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXI (1962), 363-376.

_______. "A Textual Analysis of the Earliest Greek Manuscripts of the Gospel of John." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1961.

Price, Ira M. The Ancestry of Our English Bible. 2nd ed., revised by W. A. Irwin and A. P. Wikgren. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1949.

Price, James Ligon, Jr. Interpreting the New Testament. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Prigent, P. "Un nouveau texte des Actes: Le Papyrus Bodmer XVII, P74," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses*, XLII (1962), 169-174. *N.V.*

Purdy, Alexander C. "The Epistle to the Hebrews: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by G. A. Buttrick, *et al*. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1955, XI, 577-763.

Riddle, D. W. "Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline," *Anglican Theological Review*, XVIII (1936), 220-233.

Robertson, A. T. *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. 2nd ed. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., 1928.

———. *Studies in the Text of the New Testament*. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1926.

Ropes, James Hardy. *The Text of Acts* ("The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I The Acts of the Apostles," vol. III.) London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1926.

Sanday, William. *The Gospels in the Second Century*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1876.

——— and A. C. Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. ("The International Critical Commentary") New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

Sanders, Henry A. "The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXVI (1933), 79-98.

Saunders, Ernest W. "Studies in the Doctrinal Influences on the Byzantine Text of the Gospels," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXI (1952), 85-92.

———. "The Textual Criticism of a Medieval Manuscript of the Four Gospels (Duke MS Gr. 7)." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1943.

Schäfer, K. T. "Der Ertrag der textkritichen Arbeit am Neuen Testament seit Jahrhundertwende," *Biblische Zeitschrift*, IV (1960), 1-18.

Schürmann, Heinz. *Der Einsetzungsbericht Lk. XXII. 19-20*. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1955.

Scrivener, F.H.A. *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1883.

Selwyn, Edward Gordon. *The First Epistle of St. Peter*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1949.

Sheriffs, R.J.A. "A Note on a Verse in the New English Bible," *The Evangelical Quarterly*, XXXIV (1962), 91-95.

Souter, Alexander. "Pelagius' Text of Romans 5:12, with Comment," *Expository Times*, XXVIII (1916-17), 42-43.

Souter, Alexander. *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

Sparks, H.F.D. "The Semitisms of the Acts," *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series I (1950), 16-28.

Stendahl, Krister. *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1957.

Strecker, Georg. "A Report on the New Edition of Walter Bauer's Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum," *Journal of Bible and Religion*, XXXIII (1965), 53-56.

Streeter, B. H. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925.

Swete, Henry Barclay. *The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices*. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1909.

Tasker, R.V.G. (ed.). *The Greek New Testament: Being the Text Translated in the New English Bible*. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Taylor, Vincent. "Does the New Testament Call Jesus God?" *The Expository Times*, LXXIII (1961-62), 116-118.

________. *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1949.

________. *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1952.

________. *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth*. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1920.

________. *The Text of the New Testament*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1961.

________. "Theologians of our Time: Heinz Schürmann," *Expository Times*, LXXIV (1962), 77-81.

Tischendorf, Constantine von. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 2 vols. Editio octava critica major. Leipzig: Giesecke et Devrient, 1869-72.

Titus, Eric Lane. *The Motivation of Changes Made in the New Testament Text by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria: A Study in the Origin of New Testament Variation*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1945.

Tollington, R. B. *Clement of Alexandria*. 2 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1914.

Torrey, Charles Cutler. *The Composition and Date of Acts*. ("Harvard Theological Studies," Vol. I.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916.

Torrey, Charles Cutler. "Fact and Fancy in Theories Concerning Acts," The American Journal of Theology, XXIII (1919), 61-86, 189-212.

Turner, H.E.W. The Patristic Doctrine of Redemption: A Study of the Development of Doctrine During the First Five Centuries. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1952.

_______. The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations Between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church ("Bampton Lectures" 1954) London: Mowbray, 1954.

Vaganay, Leon. An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. Trans. by B. V. Miller. London: Sands & Company, 1937.

Vogels, H. J. "Ein apokrypher Zusatz im Mt-Evangelium (20,28)," Biblische Zeitschrift, XII (1914), 369-390.

_______. Handbuch der Neutestamentlichen Textkritik. Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923.

Warfield, B. B. An Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1889.

Weiss, Johannes. Earliest Christianity: A History of the Period A.D. 30-150. Trans. by F. C. Grant, et al. Edited by F. C. Grant. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Westcott, B. F., and F.J.A. Hort. The New Testament in the Original Greek. 2 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882.

Wilder, Amos N. "The First, Second, and Third Epistles of John: Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick, et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1957, XII, 209-313.

Wiles, Maurice F. The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1960.

Williams, C.S.C. Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951.

Wilson, R. McL. Studies in the Gospel of Thomas. London: Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1960.

Wright, Leon E. Alterations of the Words of Jesus as Quoted in the Literature of the Second Century. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Zahn, Theodor von. Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons. 2 vols. Erlangen: Deichert, 1888-1889.

INDEX

INDEX OF NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES

The Passages Listed Below Contain Variants Which Have Been
Discussed in This Study

Matthew — Page

1:16 82ff.
1:18a 159f.
1:21 212f.
1:21,25 86ff.
2:17 73f.
6:13 211
16:21 150ff.
17:9 150ff.
17:23 150ff.
20:19 150ff.
21:39 140ff.
22:4 192f.
24:36 105ff.
25:1 139f.
25:41 64f.
27:16-17 102f.
28:19 8,51ff.,201ff.

Mark

1:41 99ff.
3:21 111f.
6:3 88ff.
7:4 196f.
9:29 189f.
10:24 231
10:25 231f.
12:8 140f.
13:32 105,107f.
13:33 192
15:34 141f.

Luke

1:3 72f.
2:4,5 94f.
2:5 90f.

Luke (continued) — Page

2:10 212f.
2:11 160f.
2:22 92
2:33,48 93f.
2:36 192f.
2:40 112f.
2:41,43 92f.
3:4 176
3:22 116f.
4:2 113f.,196f.
4:16 11
5:39 216f.
7:39 163f.
9:20 161f.
9:54,55-56 217f.
10:21 58ff.
10:41-42 176ff.
11:2 209ff.
11:42 96f.
16:12 97f.
16:16 230f.
16:30,31 149
20:15 140
21:32 9f.
22:19b-20 13,205ff.
22:43,44 120ff.
23:2 218f.
23:32 104
23:34a 219ff.
23:35 161f.
23:42 229f.
24:3 152
24:6 152f.
24:12,36,40,51,52 152ff.
24:27 76
24:51 155ff.

John

1:1 40

Index (continued)

John (continued) Page

1:3,4 65
1:13 95f.
1:18 135ff.,157f.
1:34 114ff.
2:3 192ff.
2:15 101f.
2:22a 149f.
3:5 8
3:5,8 197ff.
3:34 40ff.
4:24 46f.
5:25 224f.
6:64 108
6:69 163
7:1 109
7:8 110f.
7:39 43f.
7:52b 164f.
8:12 225f.
9:38,39a 138
10:29 38ff.
11:25 226ff.
11:33 99,101
12:32 124f.
13:10 199ff.
14:16-17 171f.
14:17 45f.
14:21 178
14:30 123f.
19:5 104f.
20:31 175f.

Acts

2:17 213
2:39 213f.
2:47 214
3:13 169
3:17 214f.
3:22 213
4:14 215
4:31 214
5:39 215
6:10 172
6:10-11 215
8:31,32,35 80f.
8:35 168
8:37 169,203f.

Acts (continued) Page

8:39 172f.
9:17 168
9:20 168
10:30 189f.
11:12a 44
11:17 173
15:20,29 185ff.
15:29 173
15:32 173f.
16:7 44f.
16:15 168
17:31 169
19:1 174
20:3 174
20:21 168
20:28 68ff.
28:31 169

Romans

1:4 117ff.
1:7,15 78ff.
1:16 221f.
1:18 56
6:9 147ff.
8:23 227f.
8:28 60ff.
9:5 130ff.
12:3 179
14:17 194f.

I Corinthians

2:11 44
6:20 180
7:5 189,191
7:28 195
8:3 184f.
8:6 47f.
10:9 125f.
11:29 204f.
13:3 180ff.
15:51 232ff.

II Corinthians

10:1 133

Index (continued)

Galatians	Page
2:20	134f.
5:14	222f.

Ephesians	
4:6	54ff.

II Thessalonians	
2:13	62ff.

I Timothy	
3:16	128f.

II Timothy	
3:16	74f.

Hebrews	
2:9	142ff.
9:11	228f.

I Peter	
2:21	144
3:15a	134
3:18	144f.
3:19	145ff.

II Peter	
1:20,21	76ff.

I John	
2:20	182f.
4:3	119f.
4:7,19	183f.
5:7-8	48ff.

Jude	
4b	130
5	126f.

Revelation	Page
15:3	57f.

BIOGRAPHY

The writer was born near Marianna, Florida, on December 8, 1930, the fifth son of Cary Joseph Pelt and Georgia Sellars Pelt.

After graduation from Marianna High School he attended Chipola Junior College at Marianna and Troy State College at Troy, Alabama. He received the Bachelor of Arts degree from the latter in 1952. He entered the Divinity School of Duke University in 1953 and received the B.D. degree in 1956. As an ordained minister of the Free Will Baptist Church, he served as pastor of churches in Lagrange and in Snow Hill, North Carolina, from 1953 to 1957.

In September of 1957 he joined the faculty of Mount Olive Junior College, Mount Olive, North Carolina, where he taught in the Department of Religion and later served as Dean of the college from 1958 to 1962.

In 1963 he entered the graduate school of Duke University in the Department of Religion. During the 1964-65 academic year he received a University Scholarship, and was awarded a Gurney Harriss Kearns Fellowship in Religion for the 1965-66 academic year.

The writer married the former Betty Jean Ethridge of Dothan, Alabama, in 1953. They have three children: Cary Lafayette (age 11), Teresa Lynn (age 10), and Sharon Ann (age 8).